2,00

LIBRARY
OF THE
Theological Seminary,
PRINCETON, N. J.
Case, BS480 Division
Shelf, W92 Section
Book, 1854 No.

ON THE

INSPIRATION OF HOLY SCRIPTURE;

OR, ON THE

CANON

OF THE

Old and New Testament,

AND ON THE

APOCRYPHA.

ON THE

INSPIRATION OF HOLY SCRIPTURE;

OR, ON THE

CANON

OF THE

Old and New Testament,

AND ON THE

APOCRYPHA:

TWELVE LECTURES,

DELIVERED BEFORE THE UNIVERSITY OF CAMBRIDGE.

BY

CHR. WORSDWORTH, D. D.,

CANON OF WESTMINSTER;
FORMERLY FELLOW OF TRINITY COLLEGE, CAMBRIDGE,
AND PUBLIC ORATOR OF THE UNIVERSITY.

FROM THE LAST LONDON EDITION.

PHILADELPHIA:
PUBLISHED BY HERMAN HOOKER,
S. W. CORNER OF CHESTNUT AND EIGHTH STS.
1854.

PRINTED BY ISAAC ASHMEAD.

PREFACE

TO THE SECOND EDITION.

THE present is a revised Edition of Discourses delivered before the University of Cambridge in 1847 and 1848, and published in accordance with the will of the pious and learned Founder of the Hulsean Lectureship.

The design of the present volume is described in the Introductory Lecture; and the Author has now only to invite the reader's attention to one general observation.

Theological Writers in this country, especially in the last and present century, have laboured with great diligence and zeal in demonstrating the Inspiration of Scripture from *internal evidence*. And their researches are entitled to the highest praise, and have been productive of most beneficial results.

Something, however, of great importance has still remained to be done, for the same end, though in another manner.

Almighty God has always had, and will never cease to have, a Visible Church in the World: and ever since His Word to man has been written, He has employed the Ministry of his Church to proclaim that Word, and to guard it, and to assure the World of its Inspiration.

It is, also, no less true, that wheresoever men have forgotten or despised this office of the Church in keeping, promulgating, and authenticating His Word, *there* they have been prone to call in question its Inspiration, or to reject certain parts of it, according to the suggestions of their own imaginations.

In proof of this statement, it is sufficient to refer to the melancholy examples of some Biblical Critics on the Continent, and in our own Country: which prove, that whosoever separates Scripture from the Church, is in imminent peril of losing both.

Be it also remembered, that the Head of the Church is CHRIST; and that the testimony of the Church to Scripture, both of the Old and New Testament (as the Writer has endeavored to show in the following Lectures,) is no other than the testimony of CHRIST; and that *internal* evidence, however cogent, cannot be complete, without HIS testimony, which is delivered to us through the Church.

The Author's endeavor in these Lectures, has been to apply this argument, from the *external* testimony of the Church and of its Divine Head, to Both Testaments, and thus to supply a deficiency which has probably been felt by younger Students of Theology, and by ordinary readers, for which classes the present Lectures are mainly designed.

CONTENTS.

LECTURE I.

What the foundation is on which the Canon of Scripture rests, . 9

LECTURE II.

What the foundation is of the Canon of the Old Testament, . . 29

LECTURE III.

The testimony of the Early Church on the Canon of the Old Testament, ... 56

LECTURE IV.

On the true Character and Position of the Apocrypha, ... 84

LECTURE V.

What is the foundation of the Canon of the New Testament, . . 105

LECTURE VI.

On the Inspiration and Authorship of the four Gospels and the Acts of the Apostles, ... 126

LECTURE VII.

On the Inspiration of St. Paul's Epistles, ... 145

LECTURE VIII.

On the Inspiration and Authorship of the Epistle to the Hebrews, 166

LECTURE IX.

On the Inspiration and Authorship of the Epistle to the Hebrews, 179

LECTURE X.

On the Inspiration and Authorship of the Catholic Epistles, . . 204

LECTURE XI.

On the Inspiration and Authorship of the Catholic Epistles, . . 222

LECTURE XII.

On the Inspiration and Authorship of the Apocalypse, ... 240

APPENDIX A.

THE ROMISH ARGUMENTS IN BEHALF OF THE TRENT CANON.

Vincenzi, Sessio Quarta Concilii Tridentini Vindicata; Romæ, 1842, ... 265

APPENDIX B.

ON THE TRUE CHARACTER AND POSITION OF THE APOCRYPHA.

Hooker, ... 268

APPENDIX C.

ST. AUGUSTINE'S LANGUAGE CONCERNING THE APOCRYPHA; AND CONCERNING THE JEWISH CHURCH AS THE GUARDIAN OF THE CANON OF THE OLD TESTAMENT, ... 279

APPENDIX D.

ON THE CONSEQUENCES WHICH WOULD FOLLOW FROM THE ENTIRE REJECTION OF THE APOCRYPHA, ... 283

APPENDIX E.

ON ST. PAUL'S EPISTLE TO THE HEBREWS.

Primasius Uticensis, ... 285

LECTURE I.

John iv. 39—42.

"*And many of the Samaritans of that city believed on Him for the saying of the woman, which testified, He told me all that ever I did. So when the Samaritans were come unto Him, they besought Him that He would tarry with them: and He abode there two days. And many more believed because of His own word; and said unto the woman, Now we believe, not because of thy saying: for we have heard Him ourselves, and know that this is indeed the Christ, the Saviour of the world.*"

GREAT is our reason for gratitude to Almighty God that His Holy Word is disseminated in almost every climate under heaven, and that our own country has been permitted to take an active part in the blessed work of its diffusion. Much cause also have we for thankfulness that, in our own Authorized Version of Holy Scripture, we possess the benefit of a Translation combining simplicity and dignity of language with perspicuity and fidelity of interpretation. Precious, however, as these two privileges are, yet perhaps it may be justly affirmed that the paramount blessing which we enjoy, as a Church, is this—that HOLY SCRIPTURE, pure and entire, is our RULE OF FAITH; and that nothing is to be preached by the ministers of the Church of England, *as of necessity to salvation*, which is not read in the Word of God, or may not reasonably be concluded from it.

But the office which, by God's providence, the Church

of England has been called to discharge in the guardianship and dissemination of Holy Scripture, and the inestimable gift which He has vouchsafed to her in her Authorized Version, and the privilege He has conferred upon her in enabling her to assert the Supremacy and Sufficiency of Holy Scripture in matters of Faith, not only supply just reasons for thankfulness to Him, but they are also solemn calls to calm investigation and clear demonstration of the grounds upon which certain Books are believed by us to be SCRIPTURE; that is, to be the Authentic Word of the One, All-wise, All-holy, and Almighty Creator and Governor of the world.

Suppose we receive into our hands an English Bible. Suppose we offer it to the illiterate or unbelieving. Suppose we bear it with us into distant lands, and appeal to it as an unerring Standard of faith and practice. Suppose also that the question is then put to us, How do you show that these writings, and these alone, are indeed the Word of God? Should we, let me ask, be prepared with such an answer to this most important question as would carry conviction to the mind of the inquirer?

Again, we have not only the simple and incredulous to deal with. Many also there are of our fellow-Christians in this and other lands, who acknowledge with us that God has spoken to the world, and has revealed His will in writing, but who do *not agree* with us in the *names* and *number* of the Books of which that writing consists. Some receive more than we do; some less. Are we, then, able and ready to show that the Books, *neither more nor less*, which *we* receive as Inspired, are indeed those in which the Revelation of God to man is contained?

Further still: during a period of now three hundred years, and especially in our own days, great efforts have

been made by learned Theologians* of the Romish communion, to prove the two following propositions:—

1st. That the Books which in our Bibles are commonly called *Apocrypha*, are of *equal* authority with the other books of the Sacred Volume, which we call *Canonical*, for the proof of articles of faith; and,

2ndly. That the Books of the *New* Testament were not generally received, as inspired, by the Christian Church till the *fourth century* after Christ.†

Now, if the former of these two propositions be true, then it would follow that the *Canonical* Scriptures, as we receive them, are not a *sufficient* rule of faith, but require the addition of the Apocrypha. And if the latter assertion be proved, then the written Word, even *with* the addition of the Apocrypha, cannot be, what *we* maintain *it is*, a *sufficient Rule* of *Faith;* for, according to that hypothesis, the first three centuries immediately succeeding the Apostles passed away without a distinct knowledge of what was Scripture and what was not; which we cannot imagine would have been the case, if Holy Scripture were the all-sufficient rule of the Christian faith.

If also the Scriptures were not recognized as the Word of God till the fourth century after Christ, then we have here a remarkable instance of a new Law of Faith and Prac-

* *e. g. Perrone*, Professor of Theology in the Roman College of the Jesuits, Loci Theologi 1047—1107, ed. Paris, 1842. *Vincenzi*, Professor of Hebrew in the Roman Archigymnasium. Sessio iv. Concilii Tridentini Vindicata, Romæ, Typis S. C. de Propagandâ Fide, 2 vols. Romæ, 1842—4. *Malou*, Professor of Theology in the University of Louvain. Lecture de la Sainte Bible, 2 vols. Louvain, 1846.

† Dr. Milner, End of Controversy, Letter xi., "The Canon of Scripture was fixed at the end of the fourth century." Dr. Newman's Essay on Development, p. 142. "On what ground do we receive the Canon (of the New Testament,) but on the authority of the Church of the *fourth* and *fifth* centuries? The Church at that era *decided* that certain Books were of authority." See below, Lecture V.

tice emerging, as it were, long after the Apostolic age; and it will be impossible for us to assign any *limit* to the process of Development, both dogmatical and practical, of which, if we may so speak, the canonization of books, more than two hundred years after their composition, is so striking an example.

The pious Founder of the Hulsean Lectureship in this University intended thereby to serve the cause of Revealed Religion and of the Christian Church; and since it is essential to the maintenance of Christianity that the grounds should be clearly understood on which it is affirmed that the *Canonical Books* of the Old and New Testament, as received by the Church of England, constitute the complete Word of Inspiration (for "the *main principle* whereupon our belief of all things therein contained dependeth, is, that the Scriptures are the oracles of God Himself,"*) I propose, with the Divine blessing, to examine the reasons which persuade us to recognize these writings as divine, and *these alone*.

May the Holy Spirit, the Lord and Giver of life, Who spake by the Prophets and Apostles, endue us with wisdom to perceive and with power to speak the truth, and give you willing and understanding hearts to receive and retain the same!

Before we proceed further, it must be defined, what we mean by *Canonical Books*, and by the CANON of SCRIPTURE.

The term *Canon* properly signifies a measuring Reed or Rule;† and is sometimes applied to the tongue of a balance,

* Hooker, III. viii. 13.

† The words קָנֶה, κάννα, κανών, Latin *canna*, and English *cane*, are of the same stock, and are used for a measuring *reed*, κάλαμος ὅμοιος ῥάβδω, Revel. xi. 1, hence the *Canon* of *Scripture* is 'arundo et mensura *fidei*,' Victor. Petav. ad loc. cf. Ezech. xl. passim, and Origen. de Principiis, i. 2; "certa linea perfectaque regula." The word Κανὼν

which indicates by its position whether the scales are in equilibrium. Hence, *Canonical* Books are those which form the Divine Rule, by which men ascertain whether they are walking orderly in the straight path of God's Law, and by which they *examine themselves, whether they are in the Faith*,* and weigh their lives, as it were, in the *Balance of the Sanctuary*. In a word, the *Canon* of *Scripture* is the divinely inspired Code of Belief and Practice.

Such is the sense in which *we* shall use the words *Canon* and *Canonical*. This statement is very necessary to be borne in mind; for, as we shall see hereafter, the word *Canonical* is not unfrequently used in a *wider* sense by some early Christian Writers; and is sometimes extended by them, so as to embrace those Books which in our Authorized Version are termed Apocrypha, and which may be more properly called *Ecclesiastical* Books, as having been read from time immemorial in the Christian *Ecclesia* or Church; which, certain other Books, *properly* called *Apocryphal*, never were.†

It being thus premised, that in these Discourses we shall employ the word *Canonical* in its strict sense of appertaining to the *Divine* Rule or Canon of Faith and Practice, we now proceed to inquire,—

How do we prove that certain Books are Canonical, and that they *constitute* the Canon of Scripture?

was used in a *critical* sense by the Alexandrine grammarians to designate those Authors who were received (ἐγκρινόμενοι) as *models* (Auctores Classici) in their respective departments of Literature. See Ruhnken. Hist. Crit. Orat. Gr. xciv. Thus the word was made ready to the hands of the Apostles (Gal. vi. 16.) and subsequent Theological Writers, for the use in which it is employed by them. Cf. Lectures on the Apocalypse, pp. 124, 125, 2nd ed. Credner's Geschichte des Kanons, pp. 7—59. Halle, 1847.

* 2 Cor. xiii. 5. † Compare Hooker, V. xx. 7.

To this important question, very different replies are given by different parties.

I. Some affirm that they themselves have an *intuitive* perception of the Divine nature of Scripture, and that they at once recognize the Bible to be distinct from, and superior to, all other compositions. The Spirit of God within us, they say, witnesses to the Spirit in the Scriptures, that the Scriptures are the Word of God.*

To this we reply, It is perfectly true that Scripture is admirably adapted to produce in every mind *really* influenced by the Holy Spirit, an intimate persuasion that it is the Word of God. But, "*the things of God knoweth no man, but the Spirit of God;*" and the question is, How do we know that we ourselves have the Spirit? We are *forbidden* in Scripture to believe *every* spirit, and are there commanded to *try the spirits, whether they be of God;* and we have *no* way of trying them, except by the *Word of God.* We must, therefore, *first* be sure that we *have* the *Word*, before we can ascertain whether we possess the *Spirit* of God. And, therefore, we *cannot* prove the Word by the Spirit within us, which must itself wait to be proved by the Word; *but, when* we *have* proved that we have the Word of God, and from that Word have assured ourselves that we have the Spirit, then, and not till then, we may rely on the witness of the Spirit within us to the Divine Spirit in the Word.

Let us also observe, that if *our own* persuasion, antece-

* Confessio Belgica, Art. v. Augusti Libri Symbol. p. 172. Confessio Gallica, ibid. p. iii. The language of the XXXIX Articles, (viz. "Sacræ Scripturæ nomine eos *Canonicos* libros Veteris et Novi Testamenti intelligimus, de quorum auctoritate in *Ecclesiâ nunquam dubitatum est,*") as compared with that of these Confessions, capable though these confessions are of Hooker's charitable construction, (III. viii. 15,) is very remarkable, and the more so because the Augsburgh Confession does not enter into the question of the grounds of the Canon at all.

dent to, and independent of, *external* evidence were to be regarded as an *adequate* proof of the Inspiration of Scripture, then *the consequence* would be, that there would be a multitude of Books differing greatly from each other, all possessing an equal claim to Inspiration. There is scarcely *any* Religion in the whole world which has not its own sacred Books, which its votaries receive as inspired. And if the testimony of men's minds were to be accepted as a sufficient proof of inspiration, then what claims would the Bible have above those of the Koran? And to speak only of Christians: some continental Reformers of great celebrity were betrayed by an arbitrary abuse of private judgment* into irreverent expressions concerning certain books of the New Testament, for instance, the Epistle of St. James and the Apocalypse. Were they justified herein, and shall these books be rejected by us? No. We do not, and will not, so deal with them.

Again, the Church of Rome would require us to receive the books of Tobit and of Judith, and sundry others, as of equal authority with the Pentateuch and the Gospel, because *she* is *convinced* that they are inspired. Are those books *therefore* the Word of God? By no means.

* See Seckendorf, Hist. Lutheranismi, Schol. iv. ad Indicem Primum, Luther's Vorrede zur Uebersetzung, &c., 1524. Also Dewar on German Protestantism, pp. 117, 212. Todd on the Apocalypse, p. 8. There is scarcely a book in the Bible, which, either in whole or part, has not been treated as spurious by some one or other of the Divines of Germany and Switzerland, who have thus given a great triumph to Romish Theologians, who thence conclude that the World can have no Bible, without a Pope. See Perrone, Loci Theol. p. 1077. (pt. ii. cap. i. prop. 2.) Malou, Lecture de la Sainte Bible, ii. p. 17. (Louvain. 1846.) Let me not, however, say this without referring to the valuable work of Kirchhofer, Quellensammlung zur Geschichte des Neutestamentlichen Canons, Zürich 1844, which is characterized by a spirit of piety and sobriety. The same may be said of Havernick's Einleitung in das Alte Testament, Erlang. 1836, and Guerike's Introd. to the New. Leips. 1843.

Again, some of our own writers* would have brought the rest of the world to their own persuasion, that the spurious work called Apostolic Constitutions, and some others of similar stamp, have an equal claim to be regarded as inspired with the Books of the New Testament. Was this reasonable or excusable? Far from it. Do we not, therefore, see clearly, that by making our own private persuasions the standard of Scriptural Canonicity, we should undermine the foundations of the Canon of Scripture, and make its Inspiration a matter of doubt?

II. There have been others who would rest *content* with the following proof that Scripture is the Word of God.

The condition of the world without Revelation, they justly observe, shows that a Revelation was necessary. A Revelation being needed, we have it, they add, in Scripture. For the Books of Scripture treat of a period of time co-extensive with the world's existence; they deal with the most lofty and abstruse subjects; many of them were written by unlettered men, and, yet, in dignity and sublimity they far transcend all human compositions; and all the learning of this world has never been able to discover any error in them; but, on the contrary, the more minutely they are examined, the more striking is their beauty, and the more evident is their truth. Observe also the wonderful harmony of all the parts of the sacred Volume, although from the time of the writing of Genesis to that of the Apocalypse, there intervened more than fifteen hundred years: surely, therefore, the Bible came from Him with whom *a thousand years are but as one day.*† See also how accurately the prophecies of the Old Testament are fulfilled in the history of the New. Who could predict such distant events with such

* *e. g.* Whiston, Tentamen de Const. Apost. Lond. 1711, and even Richard Montague, ad Orig. Eccles. 394.

† 2 Pet. iii. 8.

minute circumstantiality, but He alone who beholds and sees all things at a glance, and governs all things by His Word?

Consider, also, what a series of wonderful interferences, all tending to preserve, protect, and diffuse the sacred Volume, are presented to us in the records of its history, extending over more than three thousand years. Certainly, it will be confessed, that the object of such special providences was something more than human. Nay, more, if the Bible is not God's Word, it cannot be regarded with favor by God; for it professes to be from Him: and if this profession is false, it must be most offensive to Him; and it cannot be supposed that He has been working for so many hundreds of years to protect a fraud, and to disseminate a falsehood against Himself.

Again, it is a matter of history, that the most wonderful beneficial effects have been produced by the Scriptures. Nations have been reclaimed from barbarism, and rescued from vice, and emancipated from idolatry, by their means. We ourselves are witnesses of their divine power. Our moral, social, and political life, liberty, and happiness, are results of the doctrines preached by Christ and His Apostles. We know, also, from testimony independent of Scripture, and even opposed to it, that the Writers of these Books died for the faith which they were taught; we see that they affirm their own Inspiration, and we are assured by contemporary witnesses, that they gave evidence of it by working miracles, and by speaking in languages which they had never learnt. Is t in any degree credible that they, and the thousands who heard and saw them, and were converted by them, and suffered for the faith which they received from them, should have been deluded in this great matter? Is it possible that God should have allowed mankind to be so deceived by persons speaking in His name? Is it not impiety to imagine that, by enabling them to foretell future

events, and to speak with tongues, and to work miracles, and to preach doctrines consonant with, though far transcending, the dictates of nature, reason, and conscience, He should have authenticated their message to the world, if they had not been sent by Him?

These are most important considerations; and are very necessary to be borne in mind in their due order and degree. They are *essential* for the proof of the inspiration of Scripture; *but* they are not of themselves *sufficient* for that purpose.

They suppose a knowledge of Scripture and of History, and are not adapted to arrest the attention of the careless, the ignorant, and the unbeliever, who require some living voice, awakening their mind, directing them to Scripture, and informing them concerning it.

Besides, even supposing a person to be excited and guided to the study of Scripture, these evidences, of which I have just spoken, are not sufficient to produce a conviction of its inspiration in *all its parts;* they *do*, indeed, prove that God has spoken in Scripture, but they do not show that *all* the Scripture—that is, *every part* of the Bible—is, as St. Paul says, "*given by the inspiration of God;*"* and they do not *refute* the claims of all *other* books to be regarded and received as the Word of God.

We require something *more*† to demonstrate that; and this need has been recognized by the writers of Scripture, and by the Holy Spirit who inspired them. If Scripture *sufficiently proved itself* by its *own qualities*, or by the history of its authors, or by its results, the Holy Spirit (with reverence be it spoken) would not have taken so much care to provide other *visible* evidence of its divine character. The Pentateuch would not have been laid up in the Holy of

* πᾶσα γραφὴ θεόπνευστος, 2 Tim. iii. 16.

† See Hooker II. iv. 3. and III. viii. 13. Laud against Fisher, sect. 16 and 18.

Holies, near the Ark of God.* St. Paul would not have deemed it necessary to warn his hearers against being deluded by letters "*as from him*," nor to affix *visible* tokens to *all* his epistles.†

Again: *supposing that the authors of certain* Books of Scripture were proved to be inspired, it does not follow, necessarily, that *all* that they composed, and published for the use of the Church, was inspired. St. Barnabas, as we know from Scripture, was *a good man, full of the Holy Ghost*,‡ yet his Epistle is no part of Canonical Scripture. Besides, there are many Books of Scripture,—such as the Book of Judges, Ruth, the Chronicles, Job, and others,—of which the authors are unknown; so that it is clear that the proof of the inspiration of the Books of Scripture must rest upon some other grounds besides those of our knowledge of their authors, or even of the fact of their authors being inspired.

III. We are now brought to consider a third assertion concerning the grounds of the Canon of Scripture,—the assertion of the Church of Rome. She affirms that we can have no certainty upon this subject, except by resolving our faith into the teaching of the Church. She would have us believe, that whatever the Church—by which she always *means* the *Roman* branch of the Church—delivers to us *as* Scripture is to be received by us as such, *because she delivers it*.§

* Deut. xxxi. 26. † 2 Thess. ii. 2. 18. ‡ Acts xi. 24.

§ This has been the assertion of the Church of Rome from the eleventh century to our own day. It is one of the dictates of Pope Gregory VII., that "No Book or Chapter is to be regarded as Canonical without the Pope's authority;" See Cardinal Baron. Annal. Eccl. xi. p. 632, ad A. D. 1076. Pighius says, "The Church (of Rome) can *give* Canonical authority to books which have no such authority from themselves or their Author." See his Hierarch. iii. 3. Stapleton asserts the same, Relect. Contr. 5. qu. 2. art. 4. Controv. 5. lib. 9. c. 14; he says, that the Shepherd of Hermas and Apostolical Constitutions

In support of this allegation, she maintains that the *Church* is more *visible* and *apparent* than Scripture, and is also more *ancient* than Scripture; for the Church was in existence before a word of Scripture was written; and Scripture was committed to the keeping of the Church; and whatever she propounds as inspired is to be accepted as the Word of God; or, in other words, according to her teaching, the *Canon of Scripture rests on the authority of the Church of Rome.*

These affirmations contain three fallacies.

1. They confound the *present* Church of Rome, which is only a *part*, and a *corrupt* part, of the Church, with the *primitive* Church *Catholic.* We can prove—and shall hereafter do so—that the decrees of the *existing* Church of *Rome* concerning the Canon of Scripture are inconsistent with, and subversive of, the teaching of the *ancient universal Church* of Christ respecting that subject. And it is *because* we revere the testimony of the primitive Catholic Church, and the testimony of the Divine Head of the Church, namely, that of CHRIST Himself, that we cannot accept the Canon of the present Church of Rome.

2. Let it be granted that the Church is more visible than Scripture, yet it in no way follows therefrom that Scripture *derives* its authority from the Church; or that what the Church (and much less what *a part* of the Church) delivers to us as Scripture, is *therefore*, and for no other reason, to be received by us as such. To use a familiar illustration,—a sign upon a road shows the traveller the way to a city: the sign is *more visible* than the city, but it does not *make* the city; and, if it were destroyed, the city would still remain;

may be added to the Canon, if the Church of Rome pleases. And the Roman Professor Perrone thus writes in his Theological Lectures (ii. p. 1051, 1052. ed. Paris, 1842), "The Roman Church, being the Mother and Mistress of Churches, had power to constitute the true Canon of Scripture."

and when the traveller arrives at the city, the city proves itself to be the place which the sign indicated, and thus proves the credibility of the sign. So, the Christian Church, it is true, *directs* us to Scripture, but she does not *make* Scripture, nor *give* authority to it: but, on the contrary, the Word of God gives authority to the Church, and proves the truth of her testimony concerning Scripture.

3. It is said that the Church is more *ancient* than Scripture; that there was a Church of God on earth before the Old Testament; and that the Christian Church existed before any of the New Testament was written; and *therefore*, it is said, Scripture *depends* upon the Church. But this proceeds on the false assumption, that the authority of Scripture is grounded on the fact of its being *written;* whereas it is wholly derived from its being the *Word of God.* Scripture is God's Word written; the *writing* of the Word is no *necessary* condition of its existence, though it is a quality very useful for the preservation and diffusion of the Word. The Church is, indeed, called by St. Paul, "the *Pillar* and *Ground* of the truth;"* the *Pillar* of truth it is, as being a *visible* witness; and it is the *Ground* of truth, as upholding the same; but the Church is itself *based* upon the Word of God, spoken by Christ who is Himself the LOGOS or Eternal WORD.† *Other foundation can no man lay,* says the same Apostle, *than that is laid,* JESUS CHRIST. And again, *Ye are built on the foundation of the Apostles and Prophets;* that is, on the Word of God preached by Christ's Ministers both *before* and *after* His coming *Jesus Christ Himself being the head corner stone.* We are *born again, not of corruptible seed, but of incorruptible, by the Word of God. Of His own will begat He us with the Word*

* 1 Tim. iii. 15. Στύλος καὶ Ἑδραίωμα.

† Hence St. Irenæus (iii. 2.) calls the Gospel the Pillar and Foundation of the Church (στύλον καὶ στήριγμα τῆς Ἐκκλησίας τὸ εὐαγγέλιον.)

*of truth;** and this Word, preached and afterwards written, is subsequent to, and derived from, Christ; for, *in the beginning was the* WORD.†

The Church, then, is a divinely instituted Society of believers, who are born by Water and the Word; the Church is cleansed and sanctified by the Word, for *Christ loved the Church, and gave Himself for it, that He might sanctify and cleanse it with the washing of Water by the Word.*‡ She therefore owes all her being and her beauty to the Word; and she is, therefore, posterior to the Word, though not to the *writing of* the Word. This Word proceeds from CHRIST, the *Alpha and Omega* of all God's revelations; and§ by God's will, for our salvation, it was consigned to writing, and it has been committed by God to the custody of the Church, who is commanded to preach the same; but it is as preposterous to affirm that it *owes* its *authority* to the Church, as it would be to say, that a Royal Writ *depends* for its validity on the Keeper of the Great Seal; or that the power of the Monarch is *derived* from the Herald who proclaims his accession to the throne.

It is to be observed, also, that, by resolving our belief in the Canon of Scripture into the tradition of the Church, as the *sufficient* and *final cause* of our assent to the same, we should, in fact, be undermining the foundations of the *Church* herself, and leave ourselves without any ground for belief in her teaching; for this belief rests on the Word of God. But if the Word of God is to *depend* entirely for its authority on the witness of the Church, then we shall have, *in fine*, the Church *bearing testimony to herself*,—a kind of evidence which no one can be bound to receive. And this objection is much stronger against the Romish theory, when we remember that it would require us to resolve our faith in the Canon of Scripture, not into the tradition of the *primitive*

* James i. 18.
† John i. 1.
‡ Ephes. v. 25, 26.
§ Rev. i. 8.

universal Church, but into that of the *existing Roman* branch of it, which is at *variance* with that of the Catholic Church; so that, in fact, it would leave us without any sure ground for belief, either in Scripture or the Church.

IV. What, then, it may now be inquired, are the grounds on which *we* affirm that the Books called Canonical by the Church of England were dictated by the Holy Ghost?

First of all, we reply, it is an indubitable *fact* that a religious Society, known by the name of the Church, exists, and has existed in this country since the time of the Apostles: and this Society exercises a visible authority, and discharges certain public offices in Prayer, and Preaching, and the Ministry of the Sacraments, in public buildings called churches, throughout the Realm. This Society appeals to the eye and to the ear of all; and from its extent, numbers, and antiquity, is entitled to be heard with respect. The Church presents us with a Volume,* called the Holy Bible, containing writings which she affirms to be inspired by God. But, observe, she does not require us to receive them *on her sole authority*. The Church of England does not *found* the claims of the English Bible on the sanction of the *existing* English Church. No: she appeals to the testimony of the Church *Universal*, in and from the time of *Christ* and *His Apostles* to this hour. "In the name of the Holy Scriptures," she says, in her sixth Article, "we do understand those Canonical Books of the Old and New Testament, of whose authority was *never any doubt in the Church*." Thus the Church of England takes us as it were by the hand, and leads us upward by an ascending scale of past generations, and places us on the elevated platform of primitive Christianity; she lands us, as it were, on a mountain of transfigura-

* See Hooker III. viii. 14, and II. vii. 3.

tion, in the company of Moses, and Elias, and the Apostles, and of CHRIST HIMSELF.*

We find, and we shall hereafter endeavour to show, that JESUS CHRIST and His Apostles recognized the Scriptures of the Old Testament in the hands of *the Jews;* that He stamped the Jewish Canon of Scripture with His own Divine seal. *We* have received *that* Canon, and are *authorized* and *obliged* to do so by our *belief* in *Christ;* and we know that the Old Testament in our hands agrees precisely with that in the hands of the Jews at the time of our Lord's Ministry, and in the hands of Christ Himself. This, I say, we can prove from the concurrent witness of a countless number of Copies and of Versions of the Old Testament preserved both by Jews and Christians in every quarter of the globe.

Hence our belief in the integrity and inspiration of the Old Testament rests on the testimony of CHRIST.

But you may ask, perhaps; Must we not first prove that the Old and New Testaments are inspired *before* we can establish the authority of Christ?

No: it is sufficient for this purpose, to show that the Books of the Old Testament and the New are *genuine* and *authentic.* As our Lord Himself says; *The Works which I do they witness of Me;*† and these works are authenticated by the primitive, contemporaneous reception and public reading of the Gospels, in which those works are recorded.

But on this point more will be said hereafter.

To proceed: With respect to the *New* Testament, the

* Hence the assertion of St. Augustine, on which Romanist Divines lay so much stress, as if it confirmed *their* theory, is seen to be perfectly reasonable; "Ego vero Evangelio non crederem nisi me Ecclesiæ commoveret auctoritas." Contrà Epist. Fundam. c. 5. The Church may well be said *commovere;* but it is the Word alone which non *commovet* sed *stabilit, solidat, immobilem reddit.*

† John v. 35.

primitive Apostolic Church of Christ exercised a fourfold office: first, that of a contemporary Witness to its genuineness and authenticity; next, that of a Guardian of its integrity; next, that of a Herald, by public reading and interpretation of it in her religious assemblies, and by diffusion of copies of it into all parts of the world; and, finally, that of a Judge, by vindicating its divine character, and by distinguishing it from all supposititious writings claiming to be inspired, and by visiting their authors with severe spiritual penalties.

Now, we affirm, that the Apostles of Christ would never have asserted their own writings to be inspired, unless they had been persuaded of the truth of that assertion; they would never, as they did, have *commanded* the Church to *receive* their word *not as the word of men, but, as it is in truth, the word of God*,* and to *read it*† in religious assemblies, as such; and the primitive Church would never have received and read it, if she had not been convinced by *miracles* that it was what it professed to be. Nor, be it said with reverence, would Christ have signally distinguished those who claimed to be His ministers and chosen followers, if the claim which they made to Inspiration had been false; He would not have guaranteed that claim, by enabling them to work miracles in His name, the performance of which is proved by the record of them in the New Testament received as divine by the Church contemporary with it. Thus, we see that the testimony of the Church of England to the inspiration of these Books rests on the witness of the primitive Church; and *that* is founded on the authority of Christ.

Further: having had our attention arrested by the Church, and being guided by her to certain Books which are propounded to us by the Apostles and by Christ Himself; and finding that we have the testimony of the Church from the

* 1 Thess. ii. 13.

† Col. iv. 16; 1 Thess. v. 27.

time of the Apostles to our own, to their Inspiration, we then, as reasonable men, are irresistibly moved to devote ourselves to the study of these writings. And among other *facts* stated in Scripture, we find this, that Christ, whose Divine character is proved by His works,* promises in the New Testament to be *ever with His Church, and to guide His Apostles into all truth*;† that is, our belief in her initial testimony concerning the Canon of Scripture is confirmed and assured to us by Christ Himself.

Nor is this all. Having been led by the Church to the Scriptures, we find by *experience* that the more we bestow our time in hearing and reading them, the more they answer our received opinions concerning them; and *then* those *other* important considerations come in, to which we have already adverted.‡ The more we examine them, the greater reason we perceive,—in their beauty, simplicity, majesty, and sublimity, in the divine purity of their doctrine, in the wonderful harmony of all their parts, in the benefits they have conferred upon the world, in the completion of their prophecies, in the miracles wrought by Christ and His Apostles,—to be more and more convinced of the divine origin of the Scriptures. And *finally*, the HOLY SPIRIT Himself, whose word they are, witnesses to our spirit in this persuasion, and confirms, settles, and stablishes us immovably in the faith that the Scriptures received by us through the Ministry of the Church are indeed the WORD of GOD.

This proof is one of *universal* application; it comprises *all the parts of Scripture*. The Church does not present to us merely this or that chapter or book, but she delivers to us the *whole Canon* of *Scripture* as sealed by Christ and His Apostles, and declares the whole to be Divine. She

* John v. 36; x. 25; xiv. 11. Matt. xi. 2—6.

† Matt. xxviii. 20. John xvi. 13.

‡ Above, p. 16—18.

addresses herself audibly, visibly, and intelligibly to all men, —to the careless, to the illiterate, to the unbeliever; she speaks to the poor and to the simple, to the noble and the wise; and she demonstrates to every man that he is without excuse, if he receive not the Books of the Old and New Testament as the WORD of GOD.

It will be my endeavour, in the following Discourses, to exhibit more particularly what has now been presented to you in a concise and summary manner; and I would now only observe, in conclusion, that the text consists of four verses from the history of the Samaritan woman in the fourth chapter of the Gospel of St. John; and that I have chosen them as affording an apt illustration of the present argument, and as fixing it in the memory of the hearer.

The Samaritan woman *went her way into the city, and said to the men, Come see a man which told me all things that ever I did; is not this the Christ? Then they went out of the city and came unto Him, and many of them believed on Him for the saying of the woman which testified, He told me all that ever I did.*

So it is with the Church. She has received the Word of God; she is the divinely-appointed Witness, Keeper, Herald, and Interpreter of the Divine Law; but God alone is the *Legislator* from whom its authority flows. She exercises a manuductory and ministerial office, but not a final and magisterial jurisdiction. By experience we know that her authority propounding Scripture to us as divine, is the *first outward motive* which induces us to esteem it such.* The Church brings us to Christ; Christ authorizes the testimony which she has given, and confirms it by words and works of His own, and thus proves the credibility of the Church. The Samaritans, being brought to Christ by the woman, be-

* Hooker, III. viii. 14.

sought Him that He would tarry with them. He complied with their request. *He abode with them two days.* So, when *we* are brought to Christ by the Church, we beseech Him to abide with us. He graciously remains with *us in His Holy Word*, and, by His grace given to our continued prayer and meditation upon it, He confirms us more and more in our belief of its Inspiration. He remains with us not two days only, but *all days.** He shows us by infallible proofs that He Himself is the great Prophet of the Old Testament, and the great Apostle of the New; that He is indeed, Himself, as the blessed Evangelist calls Him, the WORD of God, who was *in the beginning with God*, and who is *God.*† Thus, the *Incarnate Word* instructs and assures us of the divine authority of the *Written Word*, and we now say to the Church, as the Samaritans said to the woman, *Now we believe, not any longer*‡ *because of thy saying; for we have heard Him ourselves, and know that his is indeed the Christ, the Saviour of the world.*

* Matth. xxviii. 20, Εγὼ μεθ' ὑμῶν εἰμι πάσας τὰς ἡμέρας.

† John i. 1, 2.

‡ οὐκέτι.

LECTURE II.

Rom. iii. 1, 2.

"*What advantage then hath the Jew? or what profit is there of circumcision? Much every way. Chiefly because that unto them were committed the oracles of God.*"

It was my endeavour, in the preceding Discourse, to state in general terms the nature of the evidence on which we receive as Canonical—that is, as the divinely appointed Rule of our faith and practice,—those Books which are propounded to us as such by the Church of England, and those alone.

It was then observed, that as soon as we are capable of perceiving any thing by our intellectual faculties, we find a religious Society in existence, dating from the time of the Apostles, and pervading all parts of our country. This Society, called the CHURCH of ENGLAND, presents to us certain Books as inspired, and grounds her assertion of their Inspiration not on her own authority, but on the testimony of the UNIVERSAL CHURCH in and from the age of Jesus Christ and His Apostles; that is, ultimately on the witness of CHRIST Himself. Having received this warrant for the Inspiration of the Scriptures, we are moved to search them diligently; and the more time and study we bestow on them, the stronger our belief in their Inspiration becomes; and by the influence of the Holy Spirit, whose Word Scrip-

ture is, and whom our *Heavenly Father** gives to all *who ask Him* faithfully, we are settled and stablished in the belief that Scripture is the Word of God.

Such is the outline of the proof of the Divine authority of the Books of the Old and New Testament. My present purpose is, with the Divine blessing, to demonstrate more specifically what was then stated in a comprehensive manner; and first of all to treat of the OLD TESTAMENT.

In this portion of the argument I propose to show why we receive as Canonical those Books, and those alone, which we designate as such; next, to examine the arguments of those who would require us to receive certain *other* Books, which *we* call *Apocryphal*, and who will not communicate with us or with any one who does not and cannot receive these additional books as inspired, and of equal authority with the others; and lastly, to examine the history and position of the Apocryphal books, and to invite your attention to the wisdom and felicity of that *middle* course which the Church of England, following the steps of the Church Catholic, has pursued with respect to them.

These are the topics, my brethren, which will be considered in the present and two following Discourses; and my intention is, if health and strength are granted me, to extend the inquiry further, in the Lectures of the ensuing October, and in them to examine the grounds on which we receive as Canonical the Books of the NEW TESTAMENT.

Our present concern is with the OLD TESTAMENT; and I would now proceed to show that its Books, as soon as they were written, were delivered by Almighty God to the keeping of His own people, the Jews; that by them they were received as inspired, and preserved pure and entire till the coming of Christ: that they, and they alone, were acknowledged by HIM as the sincere Word of God, that, being so authenticated by Christ, they passed into the hands of the

* Luke xi. 13.

Christian Church; and have been preserved unadulterated and unmutilated, and conveyed by an uninterrupted succession even to ourselves at this day.

Let us commence our inquiries with the PENTATEUCH, or Five Books of Moses.

The injunctions of Almighty God concerning it afford the clearest proofs of His providential care for the *declaration* of its *sanctity* and for the *maintenance* of its *inviolability*.

To Moses God Himself gives this testimony: *My servant Moses is faithful in all Mine house;** and when Moses had written the Book of the Law, *he delivered it*† *unto the Priests, the sons of Levi, which bare the Ark of the Covenant, and unto all the elders of Israel, and he commanded the Levites to take the book and to put it by*‡ *the side of the Ark of the Covenant, to be there for a witness against the people of Israel.*§

Let us remember that the Ark of the covenant was within the *Holy* of *Holies;* that upon it the Divine Presence rested in awful majesty; that it was permitted to the High Priest alone to enter the Holy of Holies once a year; and that God, on two signal occasions, vindicated the holiness of the Ark, by punishing with death the men of Bethshemesh who looked into it,‖ and Uzzah who touched it with his hand;¶ and we shall acknowledge that the integrity and sanctity of the Sacred Volume could not have been guaranteed and declared in a more striking and effectual manner than by this

* Numb. xii. 7; Heb. iii. 2.

† Hence St. Clement of Rome well says (i. 43,) ὁ μακάριος πιστὸς θεράπων ἐν ὅλῳ τῷ οἴκῳ Μωυσῆς τὰ διατεταγμένα αὐτῷ πάντα ἐσημειώσατο ἐν ταῖς ἱεραῖς βίβλοις ᾧ καὶ ἐπηκολούθησαν οἱ λοιποὶ προφῆται συνεπιμαρτυροῦντες τοῖς ὑπ' αὐτοῦ νενομοθετημένοις.

‡ Not *in*, but *by;* see Bp. Patrick on the passage.

§ Deut. xxxi. 9, 24—26. See Josh. xxiv. 26.

‖ 1 Sam. vi. 19.

¶ 2 Sam. vi. 6. 1 Chron. xiii. 9.

its juxtaposition with the Ark, enshrined in the Holy of Holies.*

Let us observe also the other means prescribed by God for its *public recognition as His Word.* At the end of every seven years, in the solemnity of the year of release,† in the Feast of Tabernacles, when all Israel were assembled before the Lord, first in the Tabernacle and afterwards in the Temple, the Law of the Lord was to be *read* before all the people. And accordingly we find‡ that *there was not a word of all that Moses commanded which Joshua read not before all the congregation.*

This *public Reading* of the Pentateuch in the presence of those many thousands who had been eye-witnesses of the miracles which it records, supplies a very strong proof of its veracity and of its inspiration. It was like a solemn appeal to all the Israelites for an attestation to those miracles which they themselves had seen. And these miracles, be it remembered, are the credentials of the Divine Legation of the Author of the Pentateuch: they are the seals of his Inspiration.

Further: for its greater honour and security, Almighty God commanded that the *kings of Israel*, as soon as they were enthroned, should make, with their own hands, a transcript of the Law from the copy guarded by the Priests and Levites.§ Accordingly we find that, as late as the times of

* Juvenal says, xiv. 102: "Tradidit *arcano* quodcunque *Volumine Moyses.*" The word *Arcanum*, as Cicero explains it, is derived "ab *arcâ*, in quâ quæ clausa sunt tuta manent." (Cic. de Fin. ii. 26.) Perhaps the Author may be allowed to refer, on the religious uses of *arcæ* and κίσται, to the authorities cited in his note on Theocritus xxi. 56, and xxvi. 6. The expression of Juvenal, *arcanum Volumen*, is remarkably appropriate to the Five Books of *Moses*, and may, perhaps, have been derived (even though Juvenal might not know the fact) from the connection of the Pentateuch with the *Ark.*

† Deut. xxxi. 10. ‡ Josh. viii. 35.

§ Deut. xvii. 18. Josh. i. 8. See also the authorities quoted by

Jehoash, one of the ceremonies of the Coronation of the Jewish Monarchs was the delivery to him of the Testimony by the Priest.*

It is asserted by Christian writers of unimpeachable veracity,† whose testimony appears to be corroborated by that of the Jewish historian Josephus,‡ that not only the Pentateuch, but *all* the Books which the Jews received as inspired, were deposited in the Sanctuary of God;§ that is, as St. Paul says, *the Oracles of God were committed to them*,‖ and were kept by them in His House.

Concerning the Prophetical Books of Holy Scripture, it is certain that they profess to be dictated by God, and that they were received as such by the Jews, who were under

Rivetus Jes. Vap. p. 553. This copy of the Priests appears to be that which is called by Maimonides, Hilcoth Tephillim vii. 11. "the book of the Court i. e. of the Priests." See Schmid, Historia Canonis, p. 229, 231. Lips. 1775. Vitringa Synag. Vet. p. 181, 182.

* 2 Kings xi. 12, and 2 Chron. xxiii. 11.

† Tertullian de Cult. Fœm. i. 3. Epiphanius. S. Augustine, de Civ. Dei, xv. 23. Canon Scripturarum qui servabatur in *Templo* Hebræi populi *succedentium* diligentiâ Sacerdotum. Joannes Damascen. de Orthod. fid. iv. 18; and Vitringa de Synag. Vet. 177.

‡ Who speaks (Antiq. iii. 3, and v. 1) of the ἡ ἐν ἱερῷ ἀνακειμένη γραφή and τὰ ἐν ἱερῷ ἀνακείμενα γράμματα. See also De Vitâ suâ, c. 75, where he speaks of his having saved the ἱερὰ γράμματα, at the taking of Jerusalem, χαρισαμένου Τίτου. These appear to have been the copies belonging to the Temple. In his History of the Jewish Wars, vii. c. v., he relates that the Law was borne in the Triumph of Titus, at Rome, and afterwards deposited in the Imperial Palace.

§ See Josh. xxiv. 26. "Joshua wrote these words in the Book of the Law of God;" i. e. annexed the book of Joshua to the Pentateuch, and deposited it in the Holy of Holies, beside the Ark. Comp. 1 Sam. x. 25. "*Samuel* told the people the manner of the kingdom, and wrote it in a *Book and laid it up before the Lord;*" which shows that the Tabernacle was a depository of sacred Archives. Cp. Schmid, Histor. Canon. p. 233, and 1 Kings ii. 3.

‖ Rom. iii. 2.

God's special guidance and protection, and who were not only warned by Him against false Prophets,* but were enjoined by Him to put them to death. The parents themselves of a false Prophet were commanded to execute judgment upon him.† Thus the reception of the Prophetical Books by God's people is a strong proof of their Inspiration.

Here also it is to be observed, that the word "Prophet"‡ among the Jews, and the corresponding word in the New Testament, is applied not only to one who *predicts* future events, but also generally to any one sent by God to *declare* His will. Hence it is that "the *Law* and the *Prophets*" comprehend *all*§ the Books of their Scripture; and when it is asserted by Jewish writers that their *Prophets* were inspired, this affirmation is meant by them to apply to the Writers of the *Historical* as well as the *Prophetical* Books contained in the Old Testament. The Book of Psalms was further secured and promulgated by liturgical use.‖

Thus, we see the Providence of God exerting itself in a most signal manner for the preservation and publication of the Sacred Books; and no less remarkable were the interferences of the same Almighty and Merciful Power to *rescue* them from destruction at several times.

For some centuries before their captivity, the Churches of Israel and Judah were corrupted with idolatry and superstition. There was a famine of *hearing the Word* of the Lord.¶ In the reign of King Asa, the Prophet Azariah said, *Now for a long season Israel hath been without the*

* Deut. xiii. 5; xviii. 20. Jer. xiv. 15. † Zech. xiii. 3.

‡ נָבִיא προφήτης.

§ This was the *popular* classification. "The Law, Prophets, and Kethubim," (or Hagiographa,) the more scientific one. Both are used in the N. T., Luke xxiv. 27, 44.

‖ Our Lord also cites it as "the Law," John x. 34. Is it not written in your *Law, I said, Ye are Gods?* Ps. lxxxii. 6.

¶ Amos viii. 11.

*true God, and without a teaching Priest, and without Law.** In the next reign, that of Jehoshaphat, when the Levites were sent on a circuit to teach in the cities of Judah, they had, we read, *the Book of the Law with them;*† an expression which appears to intimate, that though the Law existed, copies of it were scarce. In the times just preceding those of King Hezekiah, the Temple had been shut up, and was almost fallen into ruins, and no offerings were made upon the altar.‡ But that pious King restored the Liturgy, and renewed the reading of the Law.§ Again; in the two following reigns of Manasseh and Amon, the Nation relapsed into Idolatry, so that the good King Josiah, the successor of Amon, remained a stranger to the Law, even till the eighteenth year of his reign, when the Sacred Volume‖ was found by Hilkiah, the Priest, in an obscure nook of the Temple, where, probably, it had been secreted by some of the Levites, to preserve it from the idolatrous rage of King Manasseh, who had set up an idol in the House of the Lord, and built altars for all the Host of Heaven in the Courts of the Temple.¶

It is evident from these historical details, that the Word of God was often in imminent danger of extinction. Yet one single fact suffices to prove that the Scriptures were preserved pure and entire through all these corrupt and idolatrous times. Not only did God institute and continue a perpetual succession of Priests, whose duty it was *to keep knowledge*, and that the people *should seek the Law* at their mouths, for *they are the Messengers of the Lord of Hosts*,** but from the ages of Samuel downwards there was an unin-

* 2 Chron. xv. 3.

† 2 Chron. xvii. 9.

‡ 2 Chron. xxix. 7.

§ 2 Chron. xxxi. 4. 21.

‖ 2 Chron. xxxiv. 15. This appears to have been the "Temple Copy;" placed by the Ark.

¶ 2 Chron. xxxiii. 5.

** Mal. ii. 7.

terrupted succession of *Prophets*,* who were raised up by God, to be Watchmen of the House of Israel, to *sound the trumpet in Sion, to cry aloud, and show the people their transgression, and the house of Jacob their sin.*† The Prophets, we know, *did* rebuke the people for their iniquities; it is certain, from their writings and their sufferings, and from Christ's testimony to them, that they executed their office faithfully. But they never let fall a single syllable intimating that the Word of God had been mutilated or adulterated by the Jews. Such mutilation or adulteration would have been sins far too heinous to have been passed by unnoticed or connived at by them, if they had been committed. Hence we may safely conclude that no such mutilation or adulteration ever took place.

We should be guilty of great ingratitude to God, if we did not confess, with thankfulness, that it was of His Almighty goodness that the written Word was preserved, when it seemed on so many occasions to be, as it were, on the brink of destruction. Nor, ought we to be less thankful for His mercy in giving us these irrefragable *proofs* of its preservation, which otherwise, under the circumstances of the case, might have been liable to be questioned by anxious doubts, and to be controverted by sceptical surmisings.

We recognize additional reason for gratitude to Him on these two grounds, when we pursue our historical inquiries further.

In the seventy years' Captivity the Jews almost forgot their vernacular tongue; still, God raised up chosen instruments among them, to preserve and expound the Law, even at Babylon: and He has vouchsafed us evidence of this in the Book of the Prophet Daniel, who is described as a man

* What Josephus calls τὴν τῶν προφητῶν ἀκριβῆ διαδοχήν.

† Isa. lviii. 1.

skillful in all wisdom,* and who cites the *Law of Moses, and the Prophets*,† and studies the Book of the Prophet *Jeremiah*,‡ and is referred by an Angel to *the Scripture of Truth*.§

Further: it is clear, from what is recorded of Ezra, after the return of the Jews to Jerusalem, that the Scriptures had been preserved entire throughout the Captivity. Ezra is styled in Scripture a *Priest, a Scribe of the Law of the God of Heaven*;‖ and, in obedience to that Law, he ordered the Feast of Tabernacles to be kept in the seventh month; and brought forth the Law of Moses, and read it for seven days in the ears of all the people. It appears to be unquestionable,¶ that Ezra, assisted (as it would seem) by the Prophets Haggai, Zechariah, and Malachi,** all of them inspired persons, and recognized as such by Christ Himself,—(for it is certain that the Books written by them were a part of the Jewish Canon of Scripture which Christ received,)—it is indubitable, I say, that Ezra†† revised the copies then extant of the Jewish Scriptures, and collected them into one volume, and completed the Canon of the Old Testament.

The minor Prophets are specified by the Son of Sirach, as

* Dan. i. 4.
† Dan. ix. 6. 11. 13.
‡ Dan. ix. 2.
§ Dan. x. 21.
‖ Ezra vii. 12, margin.

¶ See the authorities cited by Bp. Cosin, on the Canon, and Carpzov. Introd. in V. T., cap. xviii. p. 307. ed. Lips. 1721. and Hävernick, Einleitung in V. T. p. 24—34. 44. 63.

** Some Jews of St. Jerome's age believed Malachi to be the same person as Ezra; Malachi (i. e. *angel* or *messenger*) being an *official* name. See S. Hieron. in Mal. S. Aug. De Civ. Dei, xx. 25.

†† See S. Iren. iii. 25. (with note of Feuard.) Euseb. H. E. V. 8. S. Hilar. Prolog. in Psalmos. Theodoret. Præf. in Psalm. S. Chrysostom (Homil. 8 in Hebr.) says that "God inspired a holy person to collect them, Ezra: afterwards God so ordered it that they should be translated by the LXX. And," he adds, "Jesus Christ came, and adopted these books; and His Apostles diffused them every where."

Twelve, and no more; *Let the bones of the Twelve* Prophets flourish.* Malachi is called by the Jews "the *Seal* of the Prophets," because he *closed* the prophetic writings, and his concluding prophecy, concerning John† the Baptist, connects the *end* of the Old Testament with the *beginning* of the New.

The Jewish historian, Josephus, expressly states that *no* Book written *after* this period was regarded by the Jews as inspired.‡ It was a very providential circumstance, as we shall see, that the Canon of the Old Testament was then closed.

But to return. God, in His infinite mercy, converted even the *calamities* of the Jews into means and occasions of securing and diffusing His Holy Word. The Captivity had been a grievous affliction; the loss of their language, and the dispersion of their brethren, were sore trials: but God elicited good from all these evils.

This appears as follows. Although the Temple was rebuilt, it had not the visible sign of God's presence. But now

* Eccles. xlix. 10. Cp. Acts vii. 42, where St. Stephen refers to them as comprised in one Volume.

† Mal. iv. 5. Hence are to be explained our Saviour's words (Matt. xii. 13.), *All the Prophets and the Law prophesied until John.* See Smith's Discourses, p. 301.

‡ The important citations from the Rabbis in Smith's Discourses, p. 288. 250. Euseb. Chronic. lib. ii. "*Huc usque* divinæ Scripturæ." And "ad annum primum Seleuci," Demons. Evangel. viii. init. St. Jerome writing in Palestine says (ad Isa. xlix. 21), "Post Haggæum et Zachariam et Malachiam *nullos alios* Prophetas *usque* ad *Joannem Baptistam* videram;" a most important testimony; and S. Augustine in his de Civ. Dei, xvii. c. ult., (one of his last works, completed only two years before his death, and therefore of higher credit than his earlier declarations in his work *On Christian Teaching*, and at the Councils of Hippo and Carthage,) says, "Post Malachiam, Haggæum et Zachariam et Esdram non habuerunt Prophetas usque ad Salvatoris adventum. Hos Judæ in auctoritatem Canonicam receptos *novissimos* habent."

Synagogues arose* in every part of the land; in *them*, copies of the Scriptures, made with the most scrupulous fidelity, were kept in a sacred† chest, as the Original Volume had been guarded in a chest, near the Ark, in the Holy of Holies, in the Tabernacle and Temple. In *these* Synagogues the Law of God was read three times a week; and thus His presence was diffused over the land, and the whole of Palestine became a Temple.

The Syrian King, Antiochus Epiphanes,‡ the ferocious persecutor, the type of Antichrist, endeavoured to destroy the Old Testament; *When they had rent in pieces*, we read,§ *the Books of the Law which they found, they burnt them with fire; and whosoever was found with any Book of the Testament, or if any consented to the Law, the King's commandment was that they should put him to death.* This record proves the general diffusion of the Old Testament at that time, and the veneration in which it was held by the Jews. And when Antiochus prohibited the *public reading* of the *Law*, *then*, analogous lessons from the *Prophets* were substituted in its place; till at length, when he was removed by death, *both* the Law and the Prophets were read in the Synagogues, and continued to be read through, year by year, until the Advent of HIM, of whom *Moses and the Prophets did write*, and Who came to fulfil them all.

Besides: this diffusion of Scripture was not confined to Palestine. The loss of the original Hebrew as a vernacular tongue, necessitated the production of *Chaldaic* paraphrases,

* A Synagogue, say the Rabbis, is to be erected wherever there are ten persons of full age and leisure to attend its service. See Lightfoot in Matth. iv. 23. In our Saviour's time, no town in Judæa was without a Synagogue; Tiberias had twelve, and Jerusalem four hundred and eighty. Prideaux, Connection, i. book vi. vol. ii. p. 166. Oxford, 1820.

† They are still so kept to this day. See Buxtorf, Synagoga, c. 14.

‡ B. C. 175—164. § 1 Macc. i. 54, 55.

for the use of the people, after their return. This, again, produced a class of regularly trained Expositors or *Scribes*, learned in the Law and in the Prophets. They first appear to us ranged by the side of Ezra, the Priest, standing on the pulpit of wood, at the Feast of Tabernacles, as is recorded in the Book of Nehemiah, and interpreting into Chaldee what Ezra read in the original Hebrew.* Similarly the proper Lessons of the Law and the Prophets, read first in the original Hebrew according to a stated Calendar in the Synagogue, were rendered orally, paragraph by paragraph, into the Syro-Chaldaic vernacular language, by an interpreter.†

In the Chaldee Paraphrases, thus framed, happily for Christianity, was deposited the *sense* in which most learned Jews of that and the succeeding age understood the prophecies of Scripture; and from them it is clearly proved that many predictions were applied to the MESSIAH by the best instructed Jews from Ezra to the Christian era, which *later* Jews, apostatizing from the faith of their forefathers, would alienate from Christ. Thus the loss of the vernacular tongue served not only to preserve Scripture by a Translation, but to *interpret* it by an *Exposition*.‡

Another instrument providentially supplied the learning of Ezra's age was the Masora,§ in which, with wonderful scrupulousness and fidelity, not only the number of paragraphs, but even of letters in the Sacred Text was registered, and the whole carefully guarded from either curtailment or addition.

Let us now turn our eyes to the west of Judæa. By the the conquests of Alexander of Macedon and his Generals,

* Neh. viii. 3. 10.

† See Prideaux, ii. p. 166—184. Pt. I. book vi.

‡ See Bp. Pearson on the Creed, Article ii. p. 82 and p. 117, Notes. ed. Lond. 1715.

§ Prideaux, ii. p. 135. Hottinger, Thesaurus, p. 131—138.

the Greek language was widely diffused, and had become the familiar tongue of the principal cities of Western Asia, Syria, and Egypt. Partly by force, and partly by choice, Jews were *dispersed** in large numbers in these cities: hence arose the necessity of a *Greek* version of the Scriptures for them and their proselytes. Accordingly, about two hundred and eighty years before the birth of Christ, a translation, commonly called the Translation of the *Septuagint*, or Seventy,—whether from the number of the translators, or of the elders of the Jewish Sanhedrim,—was made at Alexandria in Egypt; and thus, by God's providence, a Greek Translation, made *by* Jews and *for* Jews, and publicly read in the synagogues of the Jews,—one, therefore, against which the Jews could not make any exception, and one in the universal language of the Gentile world,—was *prepared* for the use of the Evangelists and Apostles of Christ writing the New Testament in *Greek*. From this Septuagint version, and not from the original Hebrew, the *Latin* Translations were made, which were used in the Western Church even to the time of St. Jerome, that is, to the end of the fourth century.†

Thus we see that additional provision was made for the preservation, diffusion, and exposition of the Old Testament. By the dispersion of the Jews, by the erection of synagogues in which the Sacred Books were read, and by the multiplication of copies of the Original Text and of Translations of it throughout the whole civilized world, the Old Testament was safely guarded against addition or mutilation. This was God's work. If we may so speak, the soil of the whole world was thus ploughed into deep furrows, ready to receive the sacred seed of the Gospel from the hands of the Divine Sower.

* Concerning these διασποραὶ or dispersions, see Bp. Pearson, Op. Post. ii. p. 31; and what is said below, Lecture XI.

† See the authorities in Hottinger, p. 338—343.

Of this *prospective* adaptation we have beautiful evidence in the New Testament. We behold our Blessed Lord entering the synagogue,* *as His custom was*, on the Sabbath day; we see the book of Isaiah given Him, and we hear Him expounding the Proper Lesson of the day, and applying it to Himself. At Jerusalem, after the Ascension, St. James says that *Moses of old time hath in every city them that preach him, being read in the synagogues every Sabbath day.*† We hear St. Paul declaring in the synagogue at Antioch in Pisidia after the *reading of the Law and the Prophets*, that because the Jews knew not Christ *nor yet the voices of the Prophets, which are read every Sabbath day, they fulfilled them in condemning Him.*‡ We hear him pleading at Cæsarea before the Prætorian judgment-seat, and boldly asking, *King Agrippa, believest thou the Prophets? I know that thou believest.*§ At Lystra we see the child Timothy reading the Bible.‖ If we pass into Greece, we behold Paul at Thessalonica, *as his manner was*,¶ going into the synagogue of the Jews, and *three Sabbath days reasoning with them out of the Scriptures;* we see the Berrhœans *searching the Scriptures daily.*** Even in the luxurious Corinth, we find Sosthenes, the chief ruler of the synagogue, joining himself as a fellow-labourer to Paul of Tarsus,†† who reasoned there in the synagogue every Sabbath. Crossing the Mediterranean to Alexandria, we see *Apollos, an eloquent man mighty in the Scriptures*,‡‡ and ready to become a Christian missionary in Achaia, and *mightily convincing the Jews, and that publicly, showing by the Scriptures that Jesus is Christ.*§§ And if we bend our steps along the desert road leading from Gaza to Ethiopia, we meet the

* Luke iv. 16.
† Acts xv. 21.
‡ Acts xiii 27.
§ Acts xxvi. 27.
‖ Acts xvi. 1; 2 Tim. iii. 15.
¶ Acts xvii. 2.
** Acts xvii. 11.
†† 1 Cor. i. 1.
‡‡ Acts xviii. 24.
§§ Acts xviii. 28.

Statesman of Candace sitting in his chariot, *and reading Isaiah the Prophet.**

Such is the evidence in the New Testament, concerning the diffusion of the Old and the consequent preparation for the New, at the coming of Christ.

Two questions must now be asked; and most important they are.

(1) Did these different individuals and congregations, dispersed so widely, receive the *same Scriptures?*

And (2) were those Scriptures of the Old Testament the same as *we* receive?

(1) Most providentially for the cause of true Religion, the Almighty Author of Scripture has so ordered it that we have two witnesses of unexceptionable authority on this subject: one from the great metropolis of the *eastern* part of the Jewish Church, *Jerusalem;* the other from the capital of the *western*, *Alexandria:* both Jews, both contemporary with the Apostles: the one Josephus, the other Philo.

Josephus was a Priest, a Pharisee, of the family of the Asmonean princes, deeply versed in the literature of his own country and in that of Greece, and obliged, by his peculiar studies as a controversialist, and as a historian of his own nation, to examine the documents connected with it, and to cultivate the literature of Greece, in the language of which he wrote.

One of his latest productions was a polemical treatise against Apion, a celebrated Grammarian of Alexandria, concerning the antiquity of Jewish annals. In this work he enumerates and describes the Books which his countrymen, the Jews, received as Inspired. He testifies, that, "although many years had then elapsed since their composition, yet no one had ever *dared to add any thing to them*, or to take aught from them, or to make any change in them; and

* Acts viii. 28.

that it is a principle engrafted in *all* Jews, even from their birth, to *regard them* as the Oracles of God, and to cleave to them, yea, and gladly to die for them, if necessary." Such is the testimony of Josephus concerning the Old Testament.

These Books he says, are Twenty-two* in number, and embrace a period from the Creation to Moses, and from Moses to *Artaxerxes* (that is, to the time of *Ezra ;*) these he affirmed to be rightly received as inspired by God,† and he *distinguishes* between these Books, and those which relate to the period *after* Artaxerxes, (that is, our *Apocrypha,*) by saying that these latter are not regarded as of like credit with the former, because *the* previous exact succession of *Prophets*‡ was not continued after that epoch.

The Books, therefore, which all the Jews received as inspired, in the time of Christ, are precisely the same as are received by ourselves.

It has been alleged by some persons, that this testimony of Josephus comes from *Jerusalem* alone, and that the *western* or Alexandrine Jews had a different Canon of Scripture.

To this we reply: First, Josephus says that the Canon which he is setting down was received by *all* the Jews, and that they would *all contend for it even to the death;* and next, Josephus is, it is true, a Jew of *Jerusalem*, but then he is writing, writing in a controversial treatise, to a Grammarian of *Alexandria*—that is, he is writing from the *East*

* For the specification of these *Twenty-two*, or (as by a slight modification in arrangement) *Twenty-four*, as they are sometimes called.

† δικαίως θεῖα πεπιστευμένα.

‡ Compare 1 Macc. ix. 27, (circ. B. C. 161,) speaking of the cessation of Prophets at that time, "There was great affliction in Israel, the like whereof was not since the time that a Prophet *was not seen among them ;*" so iv. 46, "They laid up the stones in the mountain of the temple in a convenient place, (B. C. 165,) until *there should come a Prophet* to show what should be done with them." Cf. 1 Macc. xiv. 41.

to *West;* and even if we could bring ourselves to believe that Josephus had any intention to deceive in this solemn matter, we cannot imagine that he would have ventured upon the public assertion which he has made concerning all Jews, if the Jews of that very city in which his antagonist resided, namely, Alexandria, had themselves been an example, by which his statement might have been refuted.

But, we have another Jewish witness, to whom we have already referred; one from Alexandria itself, and also contemporary with the Apostles, Philo. He, too, was a Pharisee, and of a priestly family, and went, on a public mission as is supposed, from the Jews of Alexandria, to Jerusalem, to offer prayers and sacrifice in the Temple there, which he calls the "Temple of *his fathers.*"*

When we consider the reverence of the Jews for their Sacred Books, to which, using almost the same terms as Josephus, Philo† bears witness, saying, that they had not altered a single word in them, and would rather die ten thousand deaths than contravene the Law, it is incredible, on the one hand, that an Alexandrine Jew should have gone up from Egypt to Jerusalem, to worship in the Temple there; or, on the other hand, that he should have been *permitted* by the Jews of Jerusalem to do so, *if* the Scriptural Canon of the one had differed from that of the other,—yes, and differed so widely as it would have done, *if* the Apocryphal Books, being equal to a sixth part of the Canonical Scripture, had been received as inspired by the one, and not so received by the other.‡

* See the conclusive evidence collected by Bp. Pearson in Acta Apost. Lect. i. 9, and Opera Posthuma, ed Churton, Conc. III. vol. ii. p. 31, to show that Jerusalem with its Temple, was regarded as the Metropolis of *all the Jews in* the Apostolic age, *wheresoever dispersed.*

† Ap. Euseb. Præp. Ev. viii. 6. μὴ ῥῆμα αὐτοὺς μόνον τῶν γεγραμμένων κινῆσαι, ἀλλὰ κἂν μυριάκις αὐτοὺς ἀποθανεῖν ὑπομεῖναι θᾶττον ἢ τοῖς ἐκείνου νόμοις καὶ ἔθεσιν ἐναντία πεισθῆναι. He is speaking specially of the Pentateuch.

‡ It is worthy of observation, that Philo, who lived in the city

Again: we know, from the first chapter of the second Book of Maccabees, that the most cordial amity prevailed between the eastern and western Jews. The Alexandrian Temple* at Leontopolis, in Heliopolitan Egypt, was built after the model of that at Jerusalem; and its religious rites corresponded with that of the sanctuary on Mount Zion; and Philo's journey to Jerusalem, for the sake of religious worship, is doubtless an example of a practice common to all the Jews of the dispersion at that period. Indeed, not to mention the Greeks, (*i. e.* the Hellenistic Jews,) who as we read in the Gospel of St. John,† came to the Feast of the Passover—the concourse of Jews from Egypt, and *from the parts of Libya about Cyrene*,‡ and from all other quarters of the habitable globe, on the day of Pentecost, that is, on the solemn anniversary of the Giving of the Law from Mount Sinai—the flocking together, I say, at Jerusalem for that Festival, of Jews, *devout men out of every nation under Heaven*, may, I think, be regarded as a proof that they *all* agreed in receiving the *same Books* as the Word of God.

On the whole, then, we find that certain Books were composed in the interval of time between Moses and Ezra, a period of a thousand years; and that these Books were preserved in the Holy of Holies, and read in the Synagogues as Divine Writings. We find, also, that these Books profess to be inspired by God; that they were received and

which appears to have produced a great part of the Apocrypha, *never cites the Apocrypha*, (see Hornemann, de Canone V. T. ex Philone, p. 28,) which he certainly would have done if it had been accounted Canonical at Alexandria in the Apostolic age. Josephus, as we have seen, *does* refer to the Apocrypha, and distinguishes between it and the Canonical Books.

* See Josephus Antiq. xiii. 3, and the Authorities cited in Hävernick's Einleitung, p. 70—72, on the identity of the Hebrew and Alexandrine Canon.

† John xii. 20. ‡ Acts ii. 10.

guarded as such by the Priests, Princes, and People of God; and that the universality of this reception, and the faithfulness of this custody, is proved to us by His Prophets. We also find, that, by multiplication and diffusion of copies, and translations of them, and by perpetual public recitation and interpretation of them, their sanctity was declared, and their integrity secured.

We have now arrived at the momentous question, How were these Books received by HIM of whom all the *Law and the Prophets did write;** the *Author and Finisher of our Faith;† the Alpha and Omega*‡ of all God's revelations,—JESUS CHRIST?

Our Blessed Lord was a constant attendant at the worship of the Synagogue, and He took part in the public reading and exposition of the Sacred Books of the Jews: thus, He gave a *practical testimony*, and a personal sanction, to the tenets of the Jews concerning those Books. *He*, the Son of God, *received* as *divinely-inspired* Scripture what the *Jews* received and delivered to Him as such. He affirmed those Books to be written by the Holy Ghost;§ and claimed to be received as the Messiah on the authority of their prophecies.‖ He frequently called those Books, "*The Scriptures;*" He commanded the Jews *to search their Scriptures;*¶ He said, *It is easier for heaven and earth to pass, than one tittle of the Law to fail;*** and again, *Verily I say unto you, Till heaven and earth pass one jot or one tittle* (that is, one *yod*, the smallest letter, and one point of a letter,) *shall in no wise pass from the Law, till all be fulfilled;*†† and again, *The Scripture cannot be broken.*‡‡ He declared that the Sadducees erred, by not understanding *the Scriptures.*§§ *They have Moses and the Prophets: let them hear them.*‖‖

* John i. 45. † Heb. xii. 2. ‡ Rev. i. 11.
§ Mark xii. 36. ‖ John v. 46; Luke xxiv. 27, 44.
¶ John v. 39. τὰς γραφάς. ** Luke xvi. 17.
†† Matt. v. 18. ‡‡ John x. 35. §§ Matt. xxii. 29.
‖‖ Luke xvi. 29.

He defined the Prophetical age between the limits of Abel and Zacharias.* In His walk with the two Disciples to Emmaus, after His Resurrection *beginning at Moses and all the Prophets, He expounded unto them in all the Scriptures the things concerning Himself.*† He said to His Apostles, *These are the words which I spake unto you while I was yet with you, that all things must be fulfilled which were written in the Law of Moses, and in the Prophets, and in the Psalms, concerning Me.*‡ So spake the Lord of Life. And, therefore, the writings of Moses and all the Prophets, and the Psalms,—that is, all the Books received by the Jews under these names, were *all the Scriptures* to Christ.

It is therefore clear that our BLESSED LORD joined with the Jews in *receiving* what *they received* as Scripture. And therefore he joined with them also in *not* receiving, what they did *not* receive as such. He therefore did not receive the Apocrypha as inspired.

Again: the Apocryphal Books amount to as much as a sixth part of the Old Testament. If they are inspired, how is it that our Blessed Lord, who is so earnest in His exhortations to *search the Scriptures*, and in His quotations from them, should never, as far as we know, have cited so much as a single sentence from them§ all? How is it also that

* Matt. xxiii. 35. The Zacharias, slain "between the temple and the altar," is the last of the Prophets whose death is mentioned in the Old Testament Canon. 2 Chron. xxiv. 19—21.

† Luke xxiv. 27.

‡ Luke xxiv. 44. He here refers to the threefold division of the Scriptures among the Jews, the LAW, the PROPHETS, and the KETUBIM or HAGIOGRAPHA, which together made "*all* the Scriptures."

§ Citation, it is obvious, would not prove Canonicity; for Aratus, Menander, and Epimenides, are cited by St. Paul. But *non-citation* is a very strong proof of *uncanonicity;* and in the case under consideration, is very like a providential protest from Our Lord Himself against the canonization of the Apocrypha.

He, who showed Himself so zealous for the honour of the *House* of God,* and who censured the Scribes and Pharisees in the severest terms, for making the Word of God of none effect by their *traditions*,† should never have breathed a single sentence of reproof against them for any mutilation‡ of the Sacred Volume, a most heinous sin, of which they were guilty in the highest degree, if the *Apocryphal* Books are inspired? On the contrary, Christ Himself, as we have seen, publicly *communicated* with them in the reception of the Scriptures which they received as the Word of God; and, by consequence, as we have said, He communicated with them in the *non-reception* of those which they did *not* receive as such.

What Christ did, His Apostles, taught by Him and inspired by the Holy Ghost, did likewise. They affirm that the Scriptures *came* not *by the will of man*, but that they who wrote them *spake as they were moved by the Holy Ghost*.§ God, *at sundry times and divers places, spake unto the Fathers, by the Prophets*.‖ They recognize the Scriptures as in the hands of the Jews. *The great advantage of the Jews*, says the Apostle, is that *to them were committed the Oracles of God*.¶ What, therefore, was committed to them was God's Word, and what *was not* committed to the Jews, was, in St. Paul's judgment no Oracle of God. Again, to the *Israelites*, he says, *pertaineth the adoption, and the glory, and the covenants, and the giviny of the law, and the service of God, and the promises*.** What, therefore, did not pertain to them was no part of the sacred deposit of Divine

* John ii. 17. † Mark vii. 13.

‡ S. Jerome says, very justly, in Isai. cap. vi. (tom. iii. p. 63. ed. Bened.) Si aliquis dixerit Hebræos libros a Judæis esse falsatos, audiat Originem . . . quod nunquam Dominus et Apostoli, qui cætera crimina arguunt in Scribis, de *hoc* crimine, *quod erat maximum*, reticuissent.

§ 2 Pet. i. 21. ‖ Heb. i. 1.

¶ Rom. iii. 1, 2. ** Rom. ix. 4.

Truth. Accordingly, the Apostles never quote any of the Apocryphal Books as the Word of God.*

Again, to Timothy, the son of a Jewess, St. Paul writes:† *Of a child thou hast known the*‡ *Holy Scriptures, which are the* things that are *able to make thee wise unto salvation;* and *all Scripture*, that is, every part of Scripture,§ *is given by inspiration of God.* What, therefore, can be more evident than that all that the Jews received as Scripture is inspired, and that what they did not so receive is not Scripture?

Let us advert here to a remarkable fact. The Original Word for *Scripture* is γραφή (*Graphé*) and this Word is a general one, and signifies any *Writing.* Now, this Word occurs fifty-one times in the New Testament. But it is *never once* applied there to any *other* kind of Writing than the Writings of the Old and New Testament—*the Scriptures.* Hence it is evident that Christ and the Authors of the New Testament regarded the Old Testament as a Writing *distinguished* from all other Writings; as *the* Writing, that is, the Writing of GOD. And, we may add, by speaking of *their own* books as *Graphai* also, the Apostles place the *New* Testament on the same level as the *Old;* they assert it also to be Divine.

Thus, then, my brethren, we have a blessed assurance from Christ Himself, that the Books which the Jews received,

* The few passages in the New Testament which are alleged to be cited from the Apocrypha, are, in fact, *not* from the Apocrypha, but from Canonical Books of the Old Testament. This has been shown by Bp. Cosin. pp. 23—27, and by Mr. Hartwell Horne, Introduction, &c., Appendix, p. 464,* Lond. 1846; and is acknowledged by Dupin on the Canon, 1 § iv. note.

† 2 Tim. iii. 15.

‡ The definite articles are to be observed here, τὰ ἱερὰ γράμματα, τὰ δυνάμενα, κ. τ. λ.

§ πᾶσα γραφή. 2 Tim. iii. 16.

and which *we* have received from them, constitute the pure and entire Word of God. The New Testament canonizes the Old; the INCARNATE WORD sets His seal on the WRITTEN WORD. The Incarnate Word is God; therefore the inspiration of the Old Testament is authenticated by God Himself.

Let it also be observed here, that *we* who believe in CHRIST, have stronger grounds for faith in those Scriptures, which were given to the Jews, than even the Jews themselves to whom they were given, and by whom they were guarded and delivered to us; for we have the witness to them of Christ, and, believing Him to be God, we receive them on the assurance of God.

It is not possible to reflect on this important subject without emotions of sorrow that our Roman Catholic brethren should have fallen into the dangerous error, of which the Jews were never guilty; that of *adding* certain books to the Canonical Scriptures of the Old Testament, and of excommunicating and anathematizing all who do not receive these Books as inspired.

This was done by the Church of Rome at the Council of Trent, in the year 1546. By the decree then passed, and still enforced by her, she makes the reception of the Apocrypha as inspired—and by consequence the non-reception of the Canonical Books as the *complete* Word of Inspiration —a term of communion with herself.

Before we embark on the consideration of this essential difference between her and ourselves, let me remind you, my younger hearers, that this question concerning the Canon of Scripture is one in which, from the ambiguity of language, you may easily be entrapped into error, unless you are carefully on your guard. You will be in danger of being deceived in this matter, if you are betrayed into entering on what is called the Patristical part of the controversy with-

out adequate study and reflection. I propose to treat on that portion of the argument in the next discourse; but I would earnestly exhort you to keep your minds steadily fixed on the following points; and then you cannot easily be perplexed by any subtleties in dealing with this subject.

1. Our Roman Catholic brethren* are accustomed to call our Canon the "Canon of the *Scribes* and *Pharisees*," and to taunt us with "preferring the Canon of the *Synagogue* to that of the *Church*." True, you will reply, our Canon *is* "the Canon of the Scribes and the Pharisees;" for "the Canon of the Scribes and Pharisees" is the Canon of CHRIST;—true, you will add, it *is* the "Canon of the Synagogue;" for the Canon of the Synagogue is "the Canon of the Church of Christ."

But, you will then proceed to say, that the Canon of *Rome*, alas! is *neither* the Canon of the Scribes *nor* of Christ; it is *neither* the Canon of the Synagogue *nor* of the Church: it is only the Canon of Rome; and by enforcing her Canon on all she is guilty of a sin which the Jews, with all their offences, never committed, that of adulterating the Holy Scriptures, and of requiring that the word of man should be received as the Word of God.

The Church of Rome will not deny that the Apocryphal Books *existed* in the time of Christ and His Apostles. If she does deny it, and affirms that they were written *after* the Christian era, then, since it is certain that they were not written by Christians, she must allow that she has canonized books written by persons who did not receive the teaching of Christ. This, I suppose, she will not admit. But it is certain, and she does not deny, that these Books, with scarcely any exception, were written *before* the coming of Christ. And, if these Books, as she affirms, *are* inspired *now*, assuredly they must *have been inspired when they were*

* See *e. g.* Perrone ii. 1059.

first written. The lapse of eighteen hundred years may impair a book, but it can never raise an uninspired book into an inspired one. Eternity itself cannot change the word of man into the word of God.

And, if these Books were inspired when they were first written, our *Blessed Lord*, who knew all things, *must have known*, and would certainly have acknowledged, them to be inspired; and would have *required* them to be received as the Word of God. But Christ did *not* receive them as such. He communicated with the Jews who did not so receive them: He recognized the Books which *they* received as "*the Scriptures;*" and His Apostles, sent by Him, with the solemn declaration, "He that heareth you heareth ME,"* and taught by the Holy Ghost who spake by the Prophets and led the Apostles *into all truth*, never received them as inspired. Therefore these books are *not* inspired; and to affirm that they *are* inspired is no less a sin than to accuse the Apostles of unfaithfulness, and to arraign Christ Himself of ignorance, and to charge the Holy Spirit of Truth with falsehood! What words, therefore, can describe the guilt which makes the reception of these Books as inspired, *a term of Church communion*, and denounces imprecations upon all who do not and cannot receive the word of man as the Word of God?

These anathemas of yours,—we must therefore now reply to the Church of Rome,—these anathemas of yours fall not only upon us, but upon the Apostles of Christ, yea, and even upon those Divine Persons of the Ever Blessed Trinity to whom we owe all truth and grace.

But let us, my beloved brethren, practise what we have been taught. We have learnt not to *render railing for railing*,† but to *pray for them who despitefully use us*.‡ Though *they curse, yet bless thou.* Therefore let us implore Him who prayed for His murderers that our brethren of the

* Luke x. 16. † 1 Pet. iii. 9. ‡ Mat. v. 44.

Church of Rome may be delivered from the *gall of bitterness, and bond of iniquity** in which Satan has bound them now for these three hundred years; lest upon them should come the heavy woe spoken of by the prophet David: "His delight was in cursing, and it shall happen unto him; he loved not blessing, therefore shall it be far from him."†

2. One general observation of great importance must be added here. Infallibility is claimed by Rome; and on this foundation she erects the proud structure of her towering pretensions. *Where* this Infallibility resides, whether in the Pope or in a Council, she has not decided; but whenever a Council makes a decree, and the Pope confirms it, then she affirms that it is to be received as of divine authority.

This claim of Infallibility has been often encountered by arguments from abstract propositions. But perhaps there is no better way of meeting it than by reducing the question to one of *fact*. *If* the Church of Rome *has* erred, she cannot be infallible; if she has erred in so fundamental a matter as the Canon of Holy Scripture, on which Christianity rests, she has erred fatally; if she has enforced this error as a term of communion, she has erred presumptuously, and if she *has so erred*, when speaking in a Council authorized by the Pope, then *all* the Roman theories of Infallibility are false; and, the foundation gone, the fabric falls.

Now the *fact* is, that the Church of Rome at the Council of Trent affirmed with an anathema, that the *Apocryphal* Books are inspired; and the Pope‡ ratified this decree, which therefore, according to all Romish theories, must be infallibly true; and Rome binds this decree on the consciences of men with a solemn oath. But we have shown that the testimony of Christ and of the Holy Spirit witnesseth that the Apocryphal books are *not* inspired. If, then, the Church of Rome were infallible, then Christ would *not*

* Acts viii. 23. † Ps. cix. 16. ‡ Pius IV.

be Omniscient, and the Holy Spirit would not have guided the Apostles into *all Truth.** But the Apostles were taught of God; the Holy Ghost is "the Lord and Giver of Life;" Christ *knoweth all things.*† Therefore the Church of Rome is not infallible, but she has erred, and still errs, in a fundamental article of faith, viz., concerning the Books of Scripture. And in setting up a claim to Infallibility she errs most dangerously; and her system, founded on *this* claim, is a house built on the sand; and they who rely on her authority resist the Spirit of Truth, and God hath sent them a *strong delusion that they should believe a lie.*‡

Lastly, let us bless God that in His infinite goodness He has given us the light of His Holy Scripture to cheer and guide us in our way through this *vale of tears*, and to comfort us in our last passage through the *valley of the shadow of death;* and that He has vouchsafed us the fullest assurance of the Inspiration and Integrity of the Scriptures, by the testimony of His Ever Blessed Son, "that we may be filled with all joy and peace in believing, and may ever abound in hope through the power of the Holy Ghost.§"

* John xvi. 13; xiv. 26.
† John xvi. 30.
‡ 2 Thess. ii. 11.
§ Rom. xv. 13.

LECTURE III.

1 Cor. xiv. 36.

"*What, came the Word of God out from you, or came it unto you only?*"*

To the Jews, says St. Paul, *were committed the Oracles of God.*† The Jewish Church, as was shown in the last Lecture, was the divinely appointed depository and guardian of all the written Revelations made by God to man, before the coming of Christ. It was recognized as such by Jesus Christ Himself.

From the testimony of Jews contemporary with Christ and His Apostles, we ascertain the number and names of the Books received by them as inspired; and those Books, which *they* received, *we* receive also; and those *alone*. *Our* Canon of the Old Testament is precisely the same as that of the Church of the Jews; that is, it is precisely the same as the Canon of JESUS CHRIST.

Here, as has been already said, we are at issue with our brethren of the CHURCH of ROME. At the Council of Trent, in the year of our Lord 1546, she affirmed that certain *other* Books,—namely, those of *Tobit*, *Judith* *Wisdom*, *Ecclesiasticus*, *Baruch*, the first and second Books of *Maccabees*, and certain additions to the Book of *Esther*, and to that of *Daniel*, namely, the Song of the *Three Children*, the story

* Or, i. e. unto *you alone*, εἰς ὑμᾶς μόνους;

† Rom. iii. 2.

of *Susanna*, and *Bel* and the *Dragon*, are to be regarded with the *same reverence and** *devotion* as the writings of Moses, and of the Prophets, and as the Epistles and Gospels of the New Testament, which she in common with other Christian Churches receives as *inspired*.

In the solemn decree,† then promulgated at that Council the Church of Rome proceeded so far as even to anathematize all who did not receive these other Books as inspired; and, at this day, she requires all her Clergy, and all her Academic teachers, to affirm, by oath, that they who do not receive this decree *cannot be saved*.‡

On the other hand, the CHURCH of ENGLAND, in her Sixth Article,‡ declares that "the Church, as Hierome saith, doth read" *such other* Books as those just enumerated, "for example of life, and instruction of manners: but yet doth not apply them to establish any *doctrine*."

The *practice*, also, of the Church of England is to read *certain chapters* from *some* of these Books in her public congregation, on some festivals and week-days. But *none* of the Proper Lessons for the *Lord's Day*§ are taken from any of them; and while the Church of Rome blends them in her Bible indiscriminately with the other Books of Scripture, the Church of England, in her Bible, places them in a separate compartment by themselves.

It will be perceived, therefore, that we follow a *middle* course with regard to these Books; we concede to them a place in our Bibles and in our Churches; but we do not allow them the *same place*, or read them at the *same time*,

* "Pari pietatis affectu ac reverentiâ."

† A brief history of this Session is given in the Author's Letters to M. Gondon, Letter iv.

‡ It says "*such* other books as," &c., and therefore does not bind any one to the exact catalogue.

§ Hence,—when a *Festival*, for which an *Apocryphal* Lesson is provided, falls on a *Sunday*, the *Canonical* Lesson of the *Sunday* ought to be read in the Church.

with the Canonical Books. We receive and read *certain portions* of *some* of them *with* Scripture, but we read *no* part of *any* of them *as* Scripture; whereas, the Church of Rome not only receives them as inspired Scripture, but *imposes* them, under anathema, as such.

We have entered on this solemn subject with no other design than that of manifesting God's goodness, in giving and preserving to us His Holy Word; and with humble desires of quickening in our hearts and yours a spirit of devout thankfulness for this inestimable gift; and with a sober but steadfast hope of promoting the cause of Truth and Love.

Therefore, let us earnestly pray to the Divine Majesty, who dictated the Scriptures, and who is the Author of Truth and Peace, that He may illuminate our hearts and minds with His Holy Spirit, while we examine the reasons which are adduced by our brethren of the Church of Rome, to persuade us that the Books which we call Apocrypha ought to be received as the Word of God.

In support of that assertion, the divines of Rome plead with us as follows:

1. To the Jews were *committed the Oracles of God.* Be it so. Behold, then, we show you, they say, the Apocryphal Books in the *Septuagint* Version of the Old Testament,—a Version, as you allow, made by *Jews*, for the use of *Jews*, and read in *their* Synagogues during almost three centuries before the coming of Christ.

Therefore, the Divines of Rome infer, the Apocryphal Books are part of the Divine Oracles. If they are not, Christ would have *reproved* the Jews for mixing them up with the Divine Word. You must, therefore, receive these Books as Scripture.

2. The Septuagint Version, they observe, was employed in the New Testament by the Apostles and Evangelists citing from the Old, and it was regarded with the greatest veneration by the Fathers of the Eastern Church; by some

of them it was looked upon as *inspired* equally with the Hebrew original; and it is the Scriptural standard of the Greek Church at this day.

3. Besides this, it was the original of all the *Latin* Versions of Scripture used in the Western Church, till the time of St. Jerome,—that is, till the end of the fourth century. The Septuagint, therefore, is avouched by the Holy Spirit employing it in the New Testament; it was sanctioned by the authority of the Christian Church, as well as by that of the Jews. It cannot be pretended that the Universal Church was in error on this vital question,—what Books are Scripture, and what are not. What, then, would have become of Christ's promise that He would be ever present with this Church? See you not, therefore, they ask, that by rejecting the Apocryphal Books, you charge the whole Church with error, and assert that the Word of Christ has become of none effect?

Such, my Brethren, are the allegations* of the Divines of Rome. What is to be said to them?

1. We readily allow that the Apocryphal Books *are* contained in the Manuscripts and Editions of the Septuagint Version, *as it now stands*. We find there the Books of Tobit, Judith, Wisdom, and the rest; but this proves *too much*, for we see *also* certain other† books which the Church of Rome does *not* admit into her list of sacred Books; so that, *if the* Manuscripts and Editions of the Septuagint are to be regarded as standards of Scripture, then the Church of Rome has *rejected* part of the Word of God.

But the truth is, that, at the time when the Septuagint Version of the Old Testament was made, few, if any, of the Apocryphal Books were *even in existence*. That Version dates from about two hundred and eighty years be-

* See Vincenzi, Sessio iv. Council. Trid. Vindicata: Pars. ii. Propp. ii.—iv. Romæ 1844.

† 3 Esdras, 3 and 4 Maccabees, Prayer of Manasseh.

fore Christ. Now the events narrated in some of the Apocryphal Books,—those of the Maccabees for instance,—did not take place till a hundred years *after* that epoch. The Book of Ecclesiasticus, as we learn from its preface, could not have been composed before the year 200, and did not appear in its present Greek form till about one hundred and thirty years before Christ. The Book of Wisdom is still more recent. The dates of the other Apocryphal Books cannot be exactly determined; but this signifies little, for it is certain that none of them were ever received as inspired by *any of the Jews who used the Septuagint Version;* and it is equally certain that they have never been received as inspired by any of the Hebrew nation to this day.*

The Jews have always affirmed that the prophetic Spirit *ceased* with the times of Ezra. Be it observed, also, that the Apocryphal Books do not *profess* to be inspired, as the Canonical Books do; indeed, they expressly *disclaim* all pretensions to Inspiration; they affirm that the Prophetical Spirit was not continued to the time at which they were written; they assert it has *ceased*, and they express a hope and belief that it will be afterwards *restored.*† They claim indulgence‡ from the reader for their own *imperfections.* In this acknowledgment of their own failings, they either speak the truth or they do not; take either supposition, and it is clear they cannot be *inspired.*

It is very true that the Jews, who were acquainted with

* S. Cyril expressly affirms that the LXX translated only the XXII Canonical Books. And compare Allen's Modern Judaism, Chapter i. Lond. 1830; and Dupin on the Canon, i. ch. vi. sect. 4, who acknowledges that none of the Apocryphal Books were originally in the LXX; and compare Mr. Grinfield's Apology for the Septuagint, pp. 51, 67, 80, 149, 158, 159, where it is shown that the existence of the Apocrypha in modern editions of the LXX affords no evidence of its Canonicity.

† See above, pp. 37 and 44, note.

‡ Prolog. Ecclesiastici, and 2 Macc. xv. 38.

the Apocryphal Books, treated them with respect, especially the Books of Wisdom and Ecclesiasticus, as we treat them, and as they will deserve to be treated, and as they ever have been treated by the Christian Church. But, so far from regarding them as *inspired*, the Jews, as is well known, impute to Christians, as a great sin, that *they* receive them as *inspired;* and they say that by so doing, the Nazarenes, as they call us Christians, have been guilty of *adding to the Word of God.*

Two things there are, my Brethren, which now operate very powerfully against the conversion of the Jews to Christianity. One is the notion, with which they are possessed, that *we* worship other beings* besides God, and that by embracing Christianity they would be guilty of *idolatry.* The other is, that we receive the Apocrypha as inspired, and that, if they became Christians, they would be conspiring with the corrupters of their own Scriptures, and exposing themselves to the punishment of those, who, in defiance of its commands, add to them or take from them, and would so incur an anathema from the God of Israel.†

It cannot, I think, be denied, that in *both* these imputations the Jews mistake the Church of *Rome* for the Church of CHRIST.

To speak only of the latter particular. They confound her practice with our belief; and hence it is plain, that the Church of Rome, by her Trent Canon of Scripture, has not only separated herself from the Apostles and from the rest of the Church, but has raised a barrier against those of the Jews who would otherwise enter into it.

That the Jews of the Apostolic age received as inspired those books of the Old Testament, and those alone, which

* See Sandys, Europæ Speculum, pp. 244, 245. Lond. 1673. Fuller's Pisgah-sight, v. chap. 5 (Append.) p. 198. H. More's Works, p. 428. Leslie's Short Method with the Jews in the Scholar Armed, ii. p. 470.

† Deut. iv. 2; xii. 3.

we so receive, and that they carefully distinguished the Apocryphal books from the Canonical, has been shown in the last discourse, from the testimony of Josephus and Philo, two learned Jews, one from the eastern portion of the Jewish Church, the other from the western; both of them contemporary with the Apostles.

That Christ and His Apostles received the Jewish Canon of the Old Testament, and delivered it into the hands of the Christian Church to be guarded by her as a sacred deposit, together with the New Testament, has also been proved. That the Scriptures of the Old Testament so delivered were received by the Christian Church, and have been read in her public congregations, together with the Gospels and Epistles from the Apostolic age to the present hour, is abundantly evident from Christian Fathers and Church Historians; and that a book which was in existence in the Apostolic age, and was not inspired *then*, could not *become* inspired in any subsequent age, is a proposition, which all who are free to exercise their reason, must, I think, admit to be true.

Having stated the fact that the Jews of the present day ground one of their strongest objections to Christianity on the erroneous supposition that the Christian Church receives the Apocryphal books as inspired,—an allegation which *would* be true, *if* the Roman Branch of the Church were the Catholic Church of Christ,—I would here submit to your consideration another argument which appears sufficient of itself to prove, that the Primitive Church of Christ never received any of the Apocryphal Books as inspired.

The early Church was collected in a great measure from the seed of Abraham. All the Apostles were Jews; the first fifteen Bishops* of Jerusalem were all of Hebrew extraction; and it is certain that the Jews do not admit, and never have admitted, the Apocrypha into their Canon. Now,

* Euseb. H. E. iv. 5.

what I would observe here is, that *if* the Apostolic Church had received the Apocrypha as inspired, an obstacle would thus have been presented to the Jews which would have impeded their entrance into the Church; whereas, we know, on the contrary, that to the best instructed among them, such as Symeon, and Nathanael, and Apollos, the passage from Judaism to Christianity was easy and natural. The Synagogue was the Porch of the Church. *If* the *Primitive* Church had required the Jews, as the Church of *Rome* requires all men, to receive the Apocrypha as of equal authority with the Law and the Prophets, such a proposition would have been rejected with indignation and abhorrence.

Let it also be remembered, that we have abundant records of the various points at issue between the Jews and the early Christians, in the writings of the ancient Fathers, for instance, Justin Martyr, Tertullian, and Cyprian. And some of these relate to the text of Scripture. But nothing can be adduced from any of them, or from any quarter whatever, to show that there ever was any controversy or difference between the Jews and first Christians concerning the Canon of the Old Testament. And no one can imagine that the Jews, who, as Philo and Josephus testify, would sooner die a thousand deaths than suffer *a word* in their Bibles to be altered, would allow Christians to add *twelve* books to their *Old Testament*, and yet never utter any remonstrance against that addition. On the contrary, many of them readily and eagerly embraced the Gospel, and became its most illustrious preachers.

It is therefore clear that the Church of Rome, by canonizing the Apocrypha, has inflicted a great injury on the people of Israel as well as on the Church of Christ. She has put herself in a false position with respect to both; and as long as she maintains her Trent Canon she cannot hope to be an instrument of heaven in the *conversion* of the Jews;

and therefore she cannot be a faithful witness of Christ, and a true preacher of His Gospel, until she rescinds it.

How, then, it may be asked, have our Roman Catholic brethren been able to persuade themselves, and would fain persuade others, that the Apocryphal Books are to be received as the Word of God?

To speak the truth, I am convinced that not one in a hundred among them has ever examined this question. They have allowed themselves to be taken captive by one of the wiliest devices which the Evil Spirit has ever framed to ensnare the souls of men, the doctrine—speciously *called*—of the Infallibility of the *Church;* whereas it is the Church of *Rome* whose decrees are obtruded upon them, in *opposition* to those of the Church, and of Christ Himself.

But having been once inveigled by the Tempter to wrap up the talent of their Reason in the napkin of Papal Infallibility, they *think* that they have no more occasion for *thinking*. And therefore it is more incumbent upon *us* to offer up earnest supplications to the Throne of Grace in their behalf, that God would be pleased to awaken them from the slumber in which they are entranced, that they may be saved from the doom of the unprofitable servant at the Great Day.

But do we then affirm that *none* of our Romanist brethren have investigated this question? No; far from it. We bear a ready testimony to the labor and learning which some of the most eminent among them, even in our own day,* have devoted to this inquiry. But we do not hesitate to assert that *they* have endeavored rather to defend the decrees of Trent than to promote the cause of Truth.

They speak as men bound by a secret spell. Having given themselves up to a system founded on the assertion of Infallibility, they are no longer free; they write in chains.

* See above, p. 11.

They know full well, that if they once allow the Church of Rome to have *erred* in so solemn a matter as the Canon of Scripture, the fabric of their faith falls to the ground. Therefore the decrees of Trent are to be maintained at any cost. Hence, their main doctrine, that the Church of Rome never has erred and never can err, has involved them in a necessity of erring; and until they renounce Infallibility they can never recover the Truth.

The question, I repeat, with them is not so much concerning the Canon of Scripture as concerning the Canon of Trent; it is not concerning the Word of God, but concerning the dictates of Rome. And till God gives them grace to love the Truth, and wisdom to embrace it, and courage to profess it, instead of hugging the chains of error in which the Arch-Enemy enthrals them, it is almost fruitless to attempt to show *them* the real character of the Trent decree respecting the Old Testament.

But, my younger hearers in this English University, it may be a profitable work to guard *you* against the subtleties by which that Decree has been advocated; and I feel a strong persuasion that, if you will carefully examine this single question concerning the CANON of SCRIPTURE, you will not only be secure against the reasonings of Romish controversialists in this important matter, but you will be convinced of the hollowness of the Romish system in general; and you will be filled with gratitude to God for His mercy towards you, in assuring you of the Inspiration and Integrity of His Holy Word, and in making you members of a Church, which, in this all-important matter, has been endued by Him with wisdom to tread in the steps of Christ and His Apostles, and of the Primitive Church.

We have already examined the argument derived by Romish Divines from the existence of the Apocryphal Books in the present editions of the *Septuagint* Version.

2. Let us now proceed to observe, that it is pleaded by Romish Theologians on behalf of these Books, that some early *Christian* Writers appear to *distinguish* between the *Jewish* and *Christian* Canon of the *Old* Testament, and to allow that, though these Books were *not* received into the Canon of the *Jews*, yet they were admitted in the first ages of Christianity into that of the *Church*.

3. It is alleged also in their behalf, that these Books are not properly called *Apocryphal*, but *Ecclesiastical*, as being read in the Christian *Ecclesia*, or Church; that they are often cited with great reverence by the early Fathers of the Church; that they were sometimes even styled by them *Scripture* and the *Word of God;* that by some of the Fathers, and by a Council of the Church at the close of the Fourth Century, that of Carthage, they are even termed *Canonical*, and that they appear to be there placed on a level with the *inspired* Books of the Old Testament.

It was from a consideration of these allegations that I took occasion to exhort you, in the last Discourse, to be on your guard how you enter, without due circumspection, on the Patristic portion of this subject. It requires a careful attention to the meaning of terms, which may be perplexing, unless viewed in relation to their context and to the general teaching of the Church. But, if you engage in the inquiry, and prosecute it with this caution, it will amply repay you for your pains; it will then afford you the greatest delight and the most solid satisfaction. Let me endeavor to show this.

It is, then, perfectly true, that the Apocryphal Books are rightly called *Ecclesiastical*, as being *read* in the *Ecclesia* or *Church*, and as distinguished from writings properly called *Apocryphal*, or concealed, and *not* so publicly read. But this does not show them to be inspired, or to have been so regarded by the Church. Be it remembered that, the

fact of a book *not* being *read* by the Church by no means necessarily proves that it is *not* Scripture, and that the *reading* of a book in the Church is no conclusive proof that it *is* Scripture. The Book of Canticles was *not* usually read in the ancient Church, nor is it in ours, but it is *Canonical* Scripture. On the other hand, the Epistles of Clement and of Barnabas, the Shepherd of Hermas, and the Acts and Sufferings of Martyrs, were, we know, *read* in *some* ancient Churches; but they are *not* therefore inspired.

Again, it is also true that some Christian Fathers say that the *Church* receives the Apocryphal Books which the *Jews* did not receive. And why? Because the Church *reads* them in her public congregations, which the Jews do not in theirs. In *this* sense it is truly said that the *Canon* of the *Church differs* from the Canon of the *Jews*. But then the Church does not receive these *Ecclesiastical Books* as of *equal* authority with the Books of the Prophets and Apostles; that is, she does not receive them *as inspired*.

We also say to our Romanist brethren,—you show us passages in the Fathers, in which these Books are quoted, and you require us therefore to receive them. True, we reply, they are quoted; but this does not prove them to be inspired. We show you, in return, that the Apostle St. Paul cites verses even from heathen poets,—Menander, Aratus, and Epimenides;*—and assuredly they were not inspired.

On the other hand, we would have you observe that neither the Apostle, nor any of his Brethren, nor their Divine Master, ever quoted a single sentence from *any one* of the Apocryphal Books of the Old Testament,†—a fact wholly unaccountable if the Apocrypha is inspired; and which seems to be a providential and prophetical protest on the part of Our Lord and His Apostles, against the canonization of these Books. It is quite true that the citation of

* 1 Cor. xv. 33. Acts xvii. 28. Tit. i. 12.

† See above, p. 49.

them would not prove them to be inspired; for heathen poems, as we have seen, and some of the lost Apocryphal Books are cited in the New Testament. But the *non-citation* of them *does* prove them to be *not* inspired. You say, indeed, that *some* of the Canonical Books of the *Old* are not cited in the New Testament. Be it so that *some* were not *specially* quoted by Him:—but what then? The *entire* Canon of the Old Testament, as we have shown, was authorized by Christ,* whereas *no part* of the Apocrypha, much less the whole, was received by Him.

But, you rejoin that some of the Fathers quote some of these Books as *Scripture*, and call them *Canonical*. Yes; and you know well, or, at least, you ought to know, that the terms *Scripture* and *Canonical* are often used by *some* of the Fathers in a very wide and general sense; and it is the part and duty of Christian wisdom and charity so to *interpret* their words and phrases, as to render them consistent with the general teaching of Christ and the Church; and not to assign to them a meaning which sets that teaching at defiance.

The word *Scripture* means *Writing;* and, in a large sense, the Apocryphal Books may well be called Scripture, as being a part of the writings which the Church distinguishes from profane compositions, treating them with peculiar honour, and reading them in public congregations, for instruction in virtuous living. You know that even the works of the Fathers† themselves are sometimes called *Scriptures*, by Ecclesiastical Authors, and by certain of your own Popes; but you do not pretend that, by so styling them they ever meant to intimate that those writings are inspired.‡

Again; the word *Canonical* means *regular*, or, belonging

* See above, pp. 47—49.

† See the examples collected by Bp. Cosin, liii. lxxvii. lxxxi. xciii. c.

‡ In Decret. 1ma Pars Dist. xix. c. 6. the Decretals are called "Canonical Scripture."

to a *Rule;* and the Apocryphal Books may well be called *Canonical* in a *certain* sense, that is, as giving salutary *moral rules;* though not Canonical for Articles of *Faith;* and (as St. Jerome expresses it,) read in the Church, "for example of life and instruction of manners, but not applied by it to establish any doctrine."

In fact, these Books occupy a *middle** position *between* the Books *strictly* called Canonical and those *strictly* called Apocryphal; and hence it has come to pass that they themselves have sometimes been called Canonical, and sometimes Apocryphal. They are Canonical, as distinguished from those Books which are properly termed Apocryphal; and they are Apocryphal, as not rising to the dignity of those which are Canonical.

These statements may be well illustrated by the language and the practice of the Church of England, with respect to the Apocrypha:

1. As to the plea founded on the *reading* of the Apocrypha in the Church.

The two Books of HOMILIES, made in the reigns of King Edward the Sixth and Queen Elizabeth, are said in our Thirty-fifth Article, "to contain a godly and wholesome doctrine, and therefore," says the Article, "we judge them to *be read in Churches.*" The Homilies contain a godly doctrine, and are, therefore, to be read in the Church. But no one, I suppose, imagines that the Church of England in making this decree, regarded them as inspired, or intended that any one should so regard them. In like manner, the Apocryphal Books were read in the public assemblies of the Church, but were not regarded by the Christian Fathers as the work of the Holy Ghost, because they were so read.

* Whence they are called ἔμμεσοι καὶ γείτονες, ὡς ἄν τις εἴποι, τῶν ἀληθείας λόγων by S. Amphilochius.

2. Concerning the term *Scripture*, as applied to the *Apocryphal* Books. The First and Second Books of Homilies were published about the years 1547 and 1562, respectively; and, in the year 1562, our Sixth Article, as it now stands, was first published. It *distinguishes* the Apocryphal Books from the Canonical, and declares that the Apocryphal are not to be applied to establish any *doctrine*. The Homilies, therefore, and the Sixth Article are almost contemporaneous expressions of the judgment of the English Church.

Now, if we refer to the Homilies, we find the Apocryphal Books often cited there, and termed* "*Scripture*," and even "*the Word of God*,"† as being comprised in the Sacred Volume of that Word. But it would be a great perversion of judgment on our part, on the strength of these citations in the Homilies, to affirm, in defiance of the Sixth Article, that the Church of England receives the Apocrypha as *inspired;* and it is no less erroneous in the Romish Controversialist, on the ground of similar citations of the Apocrypha, in the works of the early Fathers, to assert, in direct opposition to the explicit language of the Catholic Church, that she regards the Apocryphal Books as of *equal* authority with Canonical Scripture.

3. It is not my intention to affirm confidently that none of the Fathers of the ancient Church ever cited an Apocryphal book as if it were inspired. No: the Fathers were men, and therefore fallible; and we do not resolve our belief in the Inspiration of the Old Testament into the testimony of individual Fathers, or even of *all* the Fathers. We do not rest on human authority, but divine. We receive those books, which we call the Old Testament, because they were received by Christ. This being premised, let us remember

* The Book of Wisdom is so called, pp. 226. 232. Tobit is so called, p. 361. The author of Baruch is called a prophet, pp. 173. 513, ed. Oxf. 1822.

† Wisdom is so called, p. 106, ibid.

the difficulties under which the primitive and mediæval Church laboured,—difficulties of which *we*, in *this* age of printed Bibles and Prayer-Books, can scarcely form an idea. Let us consider that some of the Apocryphal Books were read in the Church, and were commonly joined together with the Canonical in Manuscript Copies of the Bible. Then we shall not be much surprised that they should have been sometimes honoured with the appellation of *Scripture;* but our hearts will be filled with thankfulness to God that there is such a strong consentient voice of testimony from almost every part of the Church Catholic, from the age of the Apostles to the time of the Council of Trent, concerning the Divine authority of the Canonical Books of the Old Testament.

We have here a *cloud of witnesses*. At the head of them, as has before been said, stands Our Blessed Lord Himself. Then the Holy Apostles. In the next century, we see Melito, Bishop of the Apostolic Church of Sardis, requested by his flock to make a book of extracts from the Old Testament, for the use of his own Church, and going to Palestine for full assurance concerning the number and names of the Books of the Old Testament, received by the Church of the country where the Gospel of Christ was first preached. We see him, when he had obtained authentic information on that subject, setting down the Catalogue of these Books. And this Catalogue coincides precisely with our own Canon.

But, (say the Romanist Divines,) the catalogue of Melito comes from Palestine; it was, therefore, the Canon of the *Jews*, and not of the *Church*. What a strange assertion is this! The catalogue of the Jews! Melito was a *Christian* Bishop; he went to Palestine on a Christian embassy: with a view of framing a Book for the use of a Christian Church. What, then, had *he* to do with the *Jewish* Canon, *as such?* True, he sets down the Jewish catalogue; but he does so, not because it is Jewish; not because it *differed* from that

of the *Church* of Palestine; but because it *agreed* with it: because the Canon of the Jews was the Canon of the Church; because, in a word, it is the Canon of Christ.

This testimony of Melito is confirmed by St. Cyril, Bishop of Jerusalem, who, in his Lectures to his Christian Catechumens, delivers precisely the same catalogue of Scriptures of the Old Testament; and warns them against confounding the Apocrypha with inspired writings. Surely it will not be contended here, that a Christian Bishop was delivering a *Jewish* Canon, as such, to candidates for Christian Baptism.*

If now we pass from Palestine to Alexandria, the birthplace of the Apocryphal Books, we hear the learned Origen† asserting that the Canonical Books are Twenty-Two, whose names he recites: we find also Athanasius distinguishing clearly between the Apocryphal and inspired writings, and declaring that *nothing is to be added to the latter.* St. Epiphanius, a native of Palestine and Bishop of Salamis in Cyprus, testifies that the Apocryphal Books were never admitted into the Sanctuary of the Jewish Temple; and that

* I have not appealed to the testimony of the Council of Laodicea in its sixtieth Canon, because its genuineness is denied, not without some show of reason, by some Romanist writers. See Vincenzi, i. c. i. p. 187. 199. If we suppose it to be genuine, and, on the whole, it appears to be so, then the reason why this Council might have thought fit, *as in that age,* when so many counterfeit and heretical books were current under the name of Scripture, to limit the public readings in the Church to the Canonical Books, strictly so called, is well stated by Hooker.

† Origen's correspondence with Africanus (i. p. 3—30. ed. Paris, 1733) shows that the additions to the Book of Daniel were not in the Hebrew Canon in his age. In vindicating himself for having quoted the History of Susanna, he does indeed express an opinion that it may be a true history, and have been cut off from the Book of Daniel by the Two Elders, p. 22—a notion which appears to indicate that more reliance is to be placed on his evidence as to facts in this matter than on his sagacity. In his Prolog. ad Cartica i. p. 36, he well says, "ab *Hebræis* Eloquia Dei ad *nos* videntur esse translata."

though useful and salutary, they are not received into the order of Divine Scriptures.

If we proceed westward, and penetrate to the northern extremity of the Adriatic Sea, we receive a similar witness from the Roman Presbyter Ruffinus at Aquileia, who, after reciting the Canonical Books as we receive them, declares, "These are the Books which our Fathers enclosed within the Canon; they judged that on these the articles of our faith must stand." He then proceeds to state that there are certain *other* Books, not called Canonical, but *Ecclesiastical*,—that is, *our Apocrypha*, as appears from his specification,—"which Books," says he, "our forefathers have thought fit to be *read* in the Church, but not to be applied to establish *any article of faith*.

But, while we adduce this testimony we do not intend to affirm that there is *nothing* in the writings of any of the Christian Fathers which may be alleged to give some countenance to the opposite side of the question. No: I have already stated that certain expressions are used by some of the ancient Fathers, which, if taken by themselves, might seem to afford some ground for that position.

For example, you might be perplexed at first by the language of the Council of Carthage, held at the close of the fourth century, at which St. Augustine was present.

One of the decrees of this Council *seems* to place the Apocryphal Books in the same rank with Moses and the Prophets. It enjoins that nothing but Canonical Writings should be read in the Church under the name of Holy Scripture, and it proceeds to annex a Catalogue of Canonical Books, among which it enumerates the *Apocryphal*.

What, then, is to be said to this decree?

1. We reply, that *no* Council of the Church,—no, nor a hundred Councils,—can *make* a book to be inspired which was not inspired *before;* and that *if* the Apocrypha was inspired in the *fourth* century, it must have been inspired in

the *first;* and that *if* it had been inspired in the first, then Christ and His Apostles would have received it as such. But they did not so receive it; and therefore it is not inspired.

If, then, the Council of Carthage *intended* to affirm that the Apocrypha is inspired, it *erred* in so doing; as it certainly *did err*, when it ascribed the Books of Wisdom and Ecclesiasticus to King *Solomon*, whereas they were not written till seven hundred years *after* Solomon's death.

2. We also observe that this Decree of that Council purports only to be a *declaration** to be communicated to other Churches beyond the seas, for their approval and confirmation; and it must be noted that the Council of Carthage was only a *provincial* one: and, therefore, its decrees are not binding on the whole Church.

3. Besides, the members of this Council having decreed that only Canonical Books should be read in the Church, proceed to say, in support of their Decree, and as a reason why it should be confirmed by other Churches,—that they themselves had received such and such books to be *read in the Church*. They also permit in the same decree that the Acts of the Martyrs should be *read in the Church* on their respective Anniversaries. But these Acts were not *inspired;* and were never imagined to be so. Therefore, they did not intend to use the term *Canonical* in its strict sense of *inspired*, but in the sense of *read in the Church;*† and they affirm that nothing is to be so read but those Books which they had received from their fathers as Canonical in *this*

* De confirmando isto canone transmarina Ecclesia consulatur. Hoc etiam *fratri* et *consacerdoti* nostro Bonifacio *vel* aliis earum partium Episcopis pro confirmando isto canone innotescat, quia (i. e. that) a patribus ista accepimus in Ecclesiâ legenda. Liceat etiam legi passiones martyrum cum anniversarii dies eorum celebrantur.

† This is conceded by the Romanist writer Jahn. See Hävernick, Einleitung, p. 85.

sense,—that is, as so *read*,—and which they enumerate as such.

4. St. Augustine, who was present at this Council, is the best interpreter of its words; and he shows that this is the true meaning of the Decree. He affirms that the Canon of Scripture, strictly so called, was established in the time of the Apostles. Whatever, therefore, was received by them as inspired, is, in his judgment, inspired; and nothing else.

He affirms also that the Jews had no inspired persons among them between Malachi* and John the Baptist. The Apocryphal Books were written at that interval. Therefore, in his judgment, they are not inspired.

But he sometimes uses the word "Canonical" in a wider sense. He says in his work on Christian Doctrine, that "of the Scriptures called Canonical, those are to be *preferred* which are *received by all Churches*, and that *those* are to be *placed next* which are acknowledged by the major and graver part of Christendom."

Now, let me inquire, can any reasonable man speak of *preference* of one Canonical Scripture, properly so called, to another? There cannot be *degrees* in *Inspiration*. There cannot be more or less in what is *Divine*. It is therefore clear that the word *Canonical* is sometimes used by Augustine in a laxer sense, so as not only to designate writings strictly speaking *inspired*, but also to embrace those which were held in reverence and read by the Church. And the word Canonical was employed in this large sense by the Council of Carthage, of which Augustine was the most illustrious member.

5. Waiving other considerations which might be adduced here, if it were worth while,† we readily allow that, from the influence of the Septuagint Version, into which the Apocryphal Books were introduced one by one, and from the almost exclusive use of this Version, and of Latin translations from

* See above, p. 38, Note. † See them in Bp. Cosin, p. 96—118.

it, instead of the Hebrew original, the African Church, in the fourth century, was in danger of confounding the Apocryphal Scripture with the inspired Word of God; and it is by no means improbable, that but for a *providential interposition*, such a confusion as this might have been propagated in the West.

In tracing the history of the Church, we see a continuous series of attempts, on the part of the Devil to turn the good things of God into evil,—not only by open hostility, but also by an insidious pretence of great veneration for the good. Scripture, being one of the best of God's gifts, has ever been the special object of his open and secret attacks. Indeed, to a reflecting mind, one of the strongest arguments for the Divine origin of the Bible arises from the perpetual assaults of the Evil spirit upon it; and from the no less constant interferences of Almighty God in its behalf.

The existence of the Septuagint Version was, as we have seen, a great blessing to the Church, by diffusing and preserving Scripture; but the Tempter labored to turn this blessing into a bane. He endeavored to do so by using the Septuagint as an instrument for drawing men's eyes from the *Divine original* to the *human translation;* and by tempting them to *substitute* Greek and Latin Versions, which were blemished by imperfections, in matter and manner, for the authentic Hebrew; and it cannot, I think, be denied, that one of the main causes of the neglect of the Hebrew in the Western, and, indeed, in the Eastern Church, was a popular notion that the Septuagint was *inspired.*

Hence, in the fourth century, the danger existed, of which we have spoken. But here, at this critical juncture, almost at the time when the Council of Carthage was sitting, the mercy of God, ever watchful over His own Word, graciously interfered. He was pleased to raise up a person, eminently qualified, by birth, position, and intellectual endowments, to vindicate and maintain the unique Inspiration of those

Books, which had been received by the Church of the Jews, and by Christ Himself.

This was St. Jerome. Born in Dalmatia, trained in the learning of Greece and Rome, he traversed in his youth the greater part of European and Asiatic Christendom, and became intimate with the most eminent Doctors of the Church. He was welcomed at Rome, and chosen to be Secretary of its Bishop, Damasus, and seemed marked out to succeed to the Episcopal throne of the Imperial City. But God had other, and, we may add, greater work for St. Jerome to do. He sent him far away from the splendours of Rome, to a quiet hermitage at Bethlehem. There, from his silent retreat, he instructed the world. There, he gave himself up, during twenty years, to the study of God's Holy Word in its original language. He bestowed the first Latin Version of the Hebrew Text on the Western Church. This was his great service to Christendom; for which his memory will be ever blessed! What a beautiful subject for contemplation, —especially to you, my brethren, who are blessed with holy hours of religious leisure in these Academic shades,—is St. Jerome in his college at Bethlehem! How beneficial may the fruits of your labours be to mankind at large, in distant lands, and in all generations!

But I pass on. In this Latin Version, St. Jerome gave distinct testimony concerning the Books of Scripture, which were found in the original Hebrew, and were received as inspired by the Jews, to whom were *committed the Oracles of God;* and thus Almighty God appeared to have intervened by his instrumentality to prevent for ever any confusion between the Apocryphal Books and those which Christ acknowledged as written by the Holy Ghost.

Behold, another cause here for thankfulness to God, for His care of Scripture and of the Church. Behold St. Jerome, a Doctor of the West,—yes, from Rome itself,—dwelling at Bethlehem, the birth-place of the Incarnate Word,

there devoting many years to the study of the Divine Oracles in the Hebrew tongue; and thence proclaiming to the West, in the Latin Prefaces which he prefixed to his Translation of the Canonical Books, the all-important Truth concerning the *Inspiration* of those Writings, and *those alone.*

Yes, assuredly, we have great reason to adore God's goodness in sending him to the East, and in employing him in the vindication of the Divine Honour of the Holy Scriptures, at the very time when such a service was most needed. And we may reflect, with devout satisfaction, on the circumstance, that our own Church has shown her gratitude to God for this providential interposition, by commemorating ST. HIEROME by name in her Sixth Article, and by adopting his words, concerning the authority of Canonical Scripture, as distinguished from the Apocrypha.

St. Jerome's evidence on the Canon of Scripture may be summed up in few words. He receives as inspired those twenty-two Books, which were received by the Jews, and which were received by Christ. Whatsoever (he says) is beside these is Apocryphal.*

The Church of Rome also, as well as the Church of England, refers to St. Jerome; she commemorates him in her Breviary, as raised up by God, to be "a principal Teacher† of the Church in the exposition of Holy Scripture." She prefixed those Prefaces of St. Jerome, of which I have spoken, as distinguishing the Canonical Books from the Apocrypha, to her own‡ Editions of the Bible even up to the time of the Council of Trent. But, *then*, in that late age,—the middle of the sixteenth century—she forsook the teaching and practice of Christ and His Apostles in this

* "Quicquid extra hos in Apocryphis ponendum."

† Breviar. Roman. Sept. 30, p. 822, ed. Paris, 1842. "Deus, Qui Ecclesiæ Tuæ in exponendis Sacris Scripturis beatum Hieronymum, *Doctorem maximum*, providere dignatus es."

‡ See Bp. Cosin on the Canon, c. 71.

great matter; she surrendered herself up to be blinded by the Evil one; she was no longer willing to behold the Truth which St. Jerome asserted, and which his Prefaces teach; and she did an act, which neither she, nor any Church in Christendom, had ever done before; she not only affirmed that the Apocryphal Books are *equal* in authority to the Apostolical and Prophetical, but she dared to anathematize, as heretics, and to attempt to cut off from all hope of salvation, all who do not receive them as such.

What does she say to this? She alleges that Jerome's testimony relates only to the Canon of the *Jews*, and that he *prudently** recommends, yes, *prudently* recommends, that, in arguing with *them*, the Christian should treat no Book as Canonical but what *they* received as such! As if Jerome was writing to the Jews, or with a view to them, and not for the use of the Christian Church, especially for the Western World! As if he does not say expressly, that the Arocryphal Books are *read* by the *Church*, but are *not* received by the Church as Canonical Scripture!†

Indeed, so explicit is St. Jerome's evidence on this subject, that the Benedictine Editor of his works, Father Martianay, felt himself obliged to make the following remarkable acknowledgment:

"I cannot disguise the truth that they who assert that Jerome is setting down the *Jewish* Canon, and not the Canon of the *Church*, err very far from the truth, and impose on their readers their *own* opinions, instead of that of St. Jerome."‡

* See Vincenzi's argument, Appendix A. (*b.*)

† Vol. i. p. 939.

‡ Ed. Paris, 1693. vol. i. p. 322. The original words of Father Martianay are as follows:—"De *Hebræorum* non *Ecclesiæ* Canone hæc verba Hieronymi intelligenda esse docet Marianus Victorius; asserit quoque Ricardus Simon Hieronymum non e *suâ*, sed ex Judæorum sententiâ loquutum, ubi nonnullos libros in Ecclesiâ (Romanâ) Canonicos inter Apocrypha volumina esse ponenda decernit. At dis-

How, then, it may be asked, does *he* defend the Romish Canon? By means of the unhappy theory, lately propounded among us,—the true and only theory of Romanism, —the theory of development.

"We know,"* he says, "that *now*, *after* the Decree of the Council of Trent, *all* these Books," (that is, all the Apocryphal) "are to be received with the *same* veneration as the other Scriptures; but in *the time* of *St. Jerome*, as appears from St. Jerome himself, these Books were *read* by the Church for instruction in life and manners, but were *not received* by her among the Canonical Scriptures."†

simulare non possumus Scriptores illos procul a vero recedere propriamque non Hieronymianam obtrudere lectoribus opinionem. Id manifeste evincunt verba quæ leguntur in Præfatione Hieronymi in Libros Solomonis *Fertur, &c.*

"Videant nunc Marianus ac Simon quo sensu Hieronymus dixerit '*Igitur Sapientia, quæ vulgo Salomonis inscribitur, et Jesu filii Sirach liber, et Judith et Tobias non sunt in Canone.*'

"Scimus quidem *post* decreta Concilii Tridentini hos omnes libros *pari* cum *cæteris veneratione ab omnibus* verè piis et orthodoxis esse *suscipiendos*. Sed nunc quæstio est de *tempore* Hieronymi, quando, ut ex eodem constat, libros jam dictos legebat quidem *Ecclesia* ad ædificationem plebis, quùm tamem ipso *non reciperet* inter Canonicas Scripturas."

* Ed. Paris, 1693. vol. i. p. 322. See the original words in the foregoing note.

† See ibid. vol. i. p. 939, and especially vol. i. p. 1170, and vol. v. p. 1113, "Apocryphos *tempore suo fieri* Canonicos nihil vetat. Compare Alphons. a Castro adv. Hær. i. c. 2. *Olim* ab aliquibus dubitatum est de libro *Sapientiæ, Tobiæ, Judith*, &c., *nunc* vero nulli de hâc re dubitare licet quia *Ecclesia*, postmodum divino Spiritu *amplius illustrata, censuit* libros præfatos meliore quam anteà lapillo numerandos." So Cardinal Bellarmine, de Verbo Dei, i. 10, admits that the Apocrypha was not received by the Church in St. Jerome's time, "quia *nondum* generale Concilium de his libris statuerat." See also M. Canus, Loc. Theol. ii. 2, 11, and a remarkable passage of Professor Vincenzi in Appendix A. (*a*) ii. to this Volume. So also Perrone, ii. p. 1053. "Ecclesia Romana omnium Ecclesiarum Mater et Magistra suâ potuit auctoritate constituere verum Scripturarum Canonem." In

According to this doctrine, which is indeed the doctrine of Rome, a Book may be inspired in the *sixteenth* century, which was not inspired in the *fourth!* The word of *man* may, after a lapse of more than a thousand years, *become* the Word of GOD! And the Church of Rome claims the power of working this change!

This doctrine leads to Infidelity.

I propose to say more, in the next Discourse, on *the motives* by which the Church of Rome was actuated in framing the Trent Decree concerning the Canon of Scripture, and to speak at large on the true character and position of the Apocryphal Books.

In conclusion, I will now offer two observations, which do not appear to have been always borne in mind by those who have discussed the question between the Churches of England and Rome, with respect to the Canon of the Old Testament.

First, then, we would address our Romanist Brethren: You bring us passages from early Christian writers, in which the Apocryphal Books are called Scripture, Canonical Scripture; you show us that they were read in the Church; and that a Council of the Church, at which St. Augustine was present, classes them with Canonical Books.

But all this (we say it respectfully) is nothing to the purpose. We read page after page, volume after volume, of your works on this subject; and we find ourselves compelled to close the book, and exclaim, What is all this but multiplying words without knowledge? We will not say it is deception for deception's sake; but we *do* say that it is a complete

p. 1062, he says, that the Canon of the Old Testament had not been completed (Canonem *nondum confectum* ab Ecclesiâ) in the *fourth* century, when, says he, the Apocryphal Books "*Canonici nequaquam erant.*"

misstatement of the whole question between us. *That* question is, *not* whether the Apocryphal Books were treated, and are to be treated, with reverence,—for the Church of England so treats them,—but, whether they are of *equal authority* for *establishing Articles* of Faith with Moses and the Prophets, and with the words of Christ and His Apostles. This *you assert;* and this *we deny.* We deny it on the authority of Christ Himself. If the Apocryphal Books are inspired, they must have been inspired at the time of Christ's ministry, and must have been received by Christ as such. They were not so received by Him; therefore they are not inspired. And shall you, or shall any man, shall all generations of men that ever lived, presume to suppose that they know more than Christ concerning His own Word? Shall you or any man ascribe to the Holy Spirit what He who was *conceived* by the Holy Ghost, as Man, and who *sent* the Holy Spirit, as God, never received as His? Persist not, we entreat you, in this dreadful sin, of claiming to know more concerning the things of God than the Son of God.

But this is not all. You not only affirm that the Apocryphal Books are of equal authority with those of Moses and the Prophets, but you will not communicate with any who do not receive the Apocryphal Books as inspired; you anathematize all who do not receive them as inspired. What! we say, Are *you the author* of Scripture? *Came the Word of God out from you?** *Or, came it to you alone?* Can you make and unmake it, as you please? Will you dare to imprecate curses on those who do not receive, what CHRIST never received? Nay, by so doing, you pour out your anathemas, not only upon us, but upon the holiest men of Christendom; you say Anathema to Jerome, Anathema to Ruffinus, to Athanasius, to Cyril, to Melito; Anathema to the ancient Churches of Palestine and Asia, Anathema to

* 1 Cor. xiv. 36.

the ancient Church of Rome, and even to the Apostles themselves. We dare not proceed further.

Rather let us remind you, with earnest prayers for your salvation, as well as our own, and for the union of us all in one and the same faith, that, by imposing this term of Communion on us, you withdraw yourself from the Communion of the true Church, and of Christ. You excommunicate yourself. And yet the Spirit of Evil has such awful power over you, that, when you are thus blinded by him, you fondly imagine that you alone can see!

Therefore, renounce your claim to Infallibility, and so free yourself from error, and embrace the truth. Revoke your Anathemas; rescind your excommunicating decrees; and so return to the Unity of the Church, and to the arms of Christ!

May it please God to take the veil from your eyes! and let us all, my brethren,—seeing this fearful instance of the malice and power of Satan,—be ever on our guard; let us watch diligently, and pray fervently to God, that He would *not lead us into temptation, but deliver us from evil.**

* Matt. vi. 13.

LECTURE IV.

1 Cor. ix. 22.

"I am made all things to all men, that I might by all means save some."

We have much cause to deplore the prevalence of party-strife in religion among us, we have greatly to lament our own lack of zeal in the cause of Christ, and deeply to mourn the tyranny of worldliness and the ravages of schism, by which Church Discipline has been weakened, and the profession of strange doctrines been made familiar to our ears; yet, amid these causes for dismay, we have great reason to admire and bless the goodness of Almighty God to the Church of England, in enabling her to maintain Scriptural and Catholic Orthodoxy in her Public Formularies of Faith.

He has been graciously pleased to endue her with a prudent, patient, and charitable spirit, and with grace to preserve it in trying circumstances of great difficulty; and it may safely be affirmed, that, by means of her Christian quietness, which some would censure as weakness, and even through the operation of these restraints, which have modified and controlled her agency, she has been providentially preserved from perilous innovations, so that she now finds herself in a favourable position for promoting God's glory by the maintenance of His Truth.

It may, indeed, appear presumptuous to affirm, that, at the present epoch of the world's history, the hopes of Chris-

tianity rest mainly, under God, on the safety of the Church of England; but it may, I think, be shown, from the characteristics which distinguish her among the Churches of Christendom in this generation, that to her specially belongs the solemn duty and the high privilege of maintaining and propagating the Gospel; and that if she be true to herself, in holding fast that which she has received, and in working out her own system without fear and without compromise, she will enjoy the favour of the Most High, and be a glory and blessing to the world.*

The felicity of her present position is mainly due to her forbearance and self-possession, in not allowing herself to be betrayed, by impatient irritation against error, into abandonment of ancient truth.

Because some other Churches, especially that of Rome, have elevated certain objects to a dignity far above their real deserts, and have thus swerved from the practice of the ancient Church, and marred the *proportion of Faith*,† the Church of England has not, therefore, thought good to run into the opposite extreme, and to strip these objects of their due honour and prescriptive rights. She has not thus put herself out of communion with Antiquity by irreverence, because others have done so by superstition. But, while she has removed the abuse, she has wisely retained the good things which were abused, and has restored them to their ancient use; and, by keeping her eye steadily fixed upon the past, she is enabled to walk more surely in the present, and to look forward more hopefully to the future.

Thus she is truly Catholic. She communicates with the One Holy and Universal Church of Christ, of all times and of all places. Thus, also, she is truly a Missionary Church;

* It is scarcely necessary to add, that the Author here includes the Irish, Scottish, American, and Colonial Churches communicating with the Anglican.

† Rom. xii. 6.

for she is enabled to hold intercourse with Jew and Gentile, and to bring them both unto Christ. Thus, like the great Apostle, she may say, "I am made all things to all men, that I might by all means save some."

Such reflections arise in the mind, when we come to consider the topic to which we are now advanced in our argument; the course pursued by the Church of England with respect to the APOCRYPHA.

In her Sixth Article, after reciting the names of the twenty-four Books of the Old Testament, which she receives as *Canonical*,—using that word in its *strict* sense of constituting the *Divine Rule of Faith*,—she proceeds to say, "The *other* Books, as Hierome saith, the Church doth read, for example of life and instruction of manners, but yet doth it not apply them to establish any *doctrine*. *Such are* these following: the third Book of Esdras,"—and the rest which we commonly call Apocrypha.

A certain honour, it will be observed, is here conceded to the Apocryphal Books. And a certain authority is denied them. They are recognized by the Church of England as having a didactic use for virtuous life and godly conversation; but they are delared to possess no validity for establishing *Articles of Faith*.

This declaration of the Church of England is illustrated by her *practice*. She places them (the Apocrypha) by themselves in her Bible; she orders certain portions of some of them to be read at certain times in her public congregations.

It is clear, then, that she regards them with respect, but not as inspired. If she did not revere them, she would not require them to be read *with* Scripture: and if she believed them to be *inspired*, she would read them *as* Scripture, and prove from them Articles of Faith.

It will be remarked, also, that, in this Article, the words, "The *Church* doth read, but doth not apply," are spoken of the Church *Universal*. That is, the Church of England

appeals here to the Church *Catholic;* and by appealing to it, she implies, that she respects its judgment, and that she conforms to its practice. And it is evident that she believes herself to be following its example, when she gives to these Books a place in her Bibles, and cites certain of them in terms of high esteem in her Homilies, and reads some of them in her public assemblies, at the same time that she *distinguishes* them from the inspired Word in her Bibles, and never reads any of them in her Churches upon the Lord's Day.

The wisdom of this *middle* course of proceeding, with regard to these *middle* Books,—for so the Apocrypha are called by the ancient Church,*—cannot be more clearly evinced than by a comparison of its results with those of the two *extremes* on either side of it.

1. Some Protestant Communions, on the one hand, would banish the Apocryphal Books altogether from the Bible and the Church.

2. The Church of Rome, on the other hand, makes a belief in their inspiration a term of Communion with herself, and declares such a belief to be necessary to salvation.

Words cannot adequately express how much it would be to be deplored, if the Church of England had ever followed, or ever should follow, either the one or the other of these two courses.

It may be solemnly affirmed that, if she were ever to take either of these two steps, she would greatly weaken her connection with the past; she would grievously impair her Catholicity; and England would be disqualified from discharging the duty of a faithful witness of ancient Truth, and from prosecuting her glorious career, as the great Missionary Nation of the World.

In order to show this, first let us consider the *former* of these two courses.

* See above Lect. iii. p. 69.

I. Some persons, even in our own Communion, have allowed themselves to speak of the Apocrypha in very disparaging terms. In the words of the judicious* Hooker, they have bestowed much pains in "raking together whatsoever might prejudice or in any way hinder the credit of Apocryphal Books." And we may add, that, without any regard to the general drift of these Books, they have involved them *all* in a sweeping condemnation, on the strength of certain words and sentences occurring in some of them.

Far be it from us to arraign the *motives* by which they have been actuated. The feelings which have animated them for the most part, have been, doubtless, those of holy zeal for God's Word, and of anxious desire that no human compositions should usurp the place of the Divine Oracles. Conceding, then, as we do most willingly, all credit due to such sentiments as these, yet we must still be permitted to ask,—and we must not shrink from asking,—whether they have not allowed themselves to be carried away from the firm footing of reason and charity, by their zeal against the Church of Rome, which treats the Apocrypha as inspired? Have they not visited *her* sins upon the Books which she has too highly extolled? Have they not suffered themselves to forget the wise and beautiful instructions contained in many of these Books? Have they duly remembered, that these Books serve to fill a chasm in the history of God's Church, and to show His goodness to her in the interval of time between the two Testaments, and exhibit the holy and heroic graces which He was pleased to bestow upon her in that season of trial, when she had no prophetic voice to cheer her? Have they borne in mind, that they give expression to her sorrow for her widowhood, and to her hope and longing for the coming of the *Desire of all Nations?*†

* Hooker, V. xx. whose observations are commended to the reader's careful consideration. See Appendix B. to this volume.

† Haggai ii. 7.

Have they not been tempted to forget the reverence paid to these Books, from the Apostolic times, by the Church Catholic, and by our own Branch of it? Have they not set up their own private opinion against the public consent of Antiquity, and been betrayed into a spirit of irritation, as if, because these Books have been raised too high by Rome, therefore, we must needs pull them down from their proper place, and trample on them with contumely and scorn?

But our own private wills are our worst counsellors; and they who listen to them will generally find, that by so doing they have effected nothing so completely as their own injury and shame.

So it is here.

Two allegations are made by some against the Apocrypha; and under colour of them it is said we ought to banish them from our Bibles and our Churches.

1. It is urged, that they authorize Romish Tenets, such as the doctrine of Merit, Prayers for the Dead, Worship of Angels: and it is further alleged that, because they seem to countenance such errors as these, they were canonized by the Church of Rome at the Council of Trent.

2. It is averred that some of these Books contain fabulous legends and immoral teaching; that they recommend, by precept and example, certain actions at variance with the Law of God.

These are serious charges. But supposing that they who make them with so much eagerness could really substantiate what they affirm, what would they gain thereby? Plainly this;—while aiming a blow at the Church of Rome, they would wound the Church of Christ, which has ever treated these Books with reverence; and they would wound the Church of England, which cites these Books in her Homilies, enumerates them with honourable mention in her Articles, gives them a place in her Bible, and reads portions of

them for example of life and instruction of manners to her People.

It is therefore evident that, if we who are Ministers of the Church of England are disposed to make an undiscriminating assault upon the Apocrypha, we must begin with retracting our subscriptions to our own Articles. We must make for ourselves new Homilies, a new Prayer-book, and a new Bible. And if we succeed in our adventure,—which Heaven forbid!—we shall greatly weaken the cause of the Gospel, and advance that of Rome.

Again: if the Apocryphal Books do indeed authorize Romish doctrine, and were *therefore* canonized at the Council of Trent, then, it would appear, that the ancient Fathers, who treated these Books with respect, and the ancient Church, which read them, could not have disapproved those Romish doctrines. Then, too, it would follow that the Church of England herself teaches Romish doctrines; for she reads these Books. And therefore, either these Romish doctrines are not false doctrines; or, the ancient Church Catholic and the Church of England are indirectly involved in the errors of Rome.

But, is it true that the Apocrypha *was* canonized at Trent *because* it authorizes, or even seemed to authorize, Romish doctrine? Far from it. The Church of Rome was in no want of the Apocrypha to authorize *any* articles of faith. She was in no need of any *written authority* for that. She affirmed at that Council* that her own *unwritten* Traditions are sufficient to prove *any* article of faith. *Her own practice* is her Bible. As her practice varies, so does her Bible. She conforms herself to nothing, and would have every thing conform to her. She had, therefore, no need of the Apocrypha. But it was her *practice* to read it; she supposed

* Concil. Trid. Sess. iv. Perrone ii. p. 1217.

that it had been canonized by two infallible Popes,* and therefore she concluded it was inspired.

Her own practice, I repeat, was her law; and this was proved remarkably in the canonization of the Apocryphal Book of Baruch at the Council of Trent. *That* Book had not been mentioned by name by any previous Council, or in the lists of the two Popes just mentioned. But it was *read* by the Church of Rome,† and had been canonized by a third Pope, Eugenius the Fourth. Therefore at the Council of Trent the Book of Baruch was set down as inspired; a fact which proves that it was the *practice* of the existing Church of Rome, and not any opinion that the Apocryphal Books authorize Romish doctrine, which produced their canonization at Trent; for there is no Book in the whole Bible which *condemns* more strongly such superstitious and idolatrous usages as have corrupted the faith and worship of Rome than this Book of Baruch, which was then declared to be inspired.

Again: the canonization of the Apocrypha at Trent is to be ascribed, in no inconsiderable degree, to the incompetency of the members of that Council. That session‡ of the Council in which the Apocrypha was canonized, under sentence of anathema on all who denied its inspiration, consisted only of fifty-three Bishops, very few of whom were skilled in theological learning, and these fifty-three, it is known, were divided in opinion on this matter.§ Relying on the *practice* of Rome as their guide, and on the Vulgate,

* Popes Innocent and Gelasius.

† Sarpi's History of Council of Trent, ad A. D. 1546.

‡ The *fourth* Session of the Council of Trent, A. D. 1546. See the names of these fifty-three in Labbè's Concilia XIV. p. 745. Streitwolf, Libri Symbol. Eccl. Cath. II. p. 21. Cp. Letters to Gondon, Letter iv., for a fuller description of the Council.

§ Sarpi's History of the Council of Trent, ad ann. 1546. See also Cardinal Pallavicini's History, lib. vi. cap. xi.

or Latin Version, which she had adopted, and which they designated as the *authentic* standard of Scripture, and which contains these Books blended with the Canonical, they gave no due consideration to the subject; and, as if driven on by a spirit of infatuation, they came to a hasty conclusion and bound themselves and others, or rather surrendered themselves to be bound by the Enemy of mankind, in the chains of error. And how much soever learned and reflecting Romanists may now desire—and we cannot doubt that many of them do desire—to be rid of this decree, yet they cannot free themselves from it, unless they are prepared to renounce the doctrine of Infallibility upon which the Papal system is based. May God of His mercy grant that they may have grace to reject error, disguised under the mask of Inerrancy, and, by allowing themselves to be fallible, recover truth!

But to return. We do not scruple to affirm that, whatever may seem to be the tendency of certain expressions in some of the Apocryphal Books taken by themselves, yet the teaching of the Apocrypha, fairly construed, is condemnatory of Romish error, and in harmony with Catholic Truth.

2. We are now brought to consider the second allegation. While we thus speak, do we intend to say that no flaws may be found in the Apocrypha? By no means. We do not believe them to be inspired; we are sure that they are human compositions, and that, as such, they partake of the imperfections of humanity. We do not, therefore, read the Apocrypha as Canonical Scripture; and we believe that the blemishes, which are referred to, will be found only in those Apocryphal Books, or in those portions of the Apocryphal Books, which we *never read*. And we proceed to say that, even from these imperfections themselves, every thoughtful person will derive lessons of great practical utility.

The case of reading the Apocrypha is very similar to that of the commemoration of the Saints of God by anniversary festivals and religious services. What the Saints are to the

Divine Author of all Sanctity, that the Apocryphal Books are to Inspired Scripture.

The Author of the Epistle to the Hebrews, in the eleventh chapter, ushers in a long train of Patriarchs, Prophets, Saints, and Martyrs, *of whom the world was not worthy;* and yet not one of these who are there canonized by the Holy Ghost, was exempt from human frailty. So the Church of Christ inserts in her Calendar the names of those whose memories live in the heart of Christendom. All these were men of like infirmities with ourselves; and by celebrating their festivals we glorify HIM from whom all their graces were derived; and the purity and brightness of the One Only perfect example, JESUS CHRIST, shows Itself in more radiant lustre when compared with these lesser lights, although they are confessed to be what human nature has produced most excellent. And by dwelling reverently on the memories of the Saints departed in God's Holy Faith and Fear, we hold spiritual communion with the mystical Body of Christ in every age. So in reading and revering Apocryphal Books, we maintain our fellowship with the Church Catholic, which has long received and read them; we love, and live in, the past; we do what is so beautifully taught in the Lesson of that Apocryphal Book of Ecclesiasticus,* read in the annual commemorations of Founders and Benefactors in our ancient colleges in this University, *we praise famous men and our fathers that begat us.*

So, even by the *imperfections* of these Books thus read and revered, we feel ourselves admonished and incited to admire the unattainable perfection, and to adore the Divine beauty, of the *Inspired Scriptures*, from which the wisdom of the Apocryphal Books has been derived, like rays streaming from one glorious orb of inexhaustible light, and to

* Chap. xliv. See Celebratio Cœnæ, &c. in Commendationibus Benefactorum, Lond. 1560. Anno 2do. Eliz. where the reading of this lesson is enjoined.

which they bear a willing testimony of lowly homage and of devout veneration.*

Further; *The end of the commandment is charity;*† and we are forbidden to *put a stumbling-block*‡ in any one's way, or to *give offence* to any; we are commanded by God to do all things for *mutual edification*, and for *His glory*.§ But by banishing the Apocrypha from our Bibles and our Churches, we should violate these sacred precepts; we should destroy one of our means of communion with other Churches, and should produce discord, where Christ intended that there should be only love.

If you carry a Bible, *without* the Apocryphal Books, into Greece, Asia, and Palestine,—that is, into those countries to which the Gospel owes its origin and language, you would be told that you have *not* the Bible, but only a *mutilated* copy of it. The Greek Church, which agrees with the ancient Church Catholic in venerating the Apocrypha, which is contained in its authorized Septuagint, but does not regard it as inspired, would renounce you as guilty of neoteric and sectarian error, if you presented her with a Bible not containing the Apocrypha.

If you pass over to Italy and France, or to Spain and Portugal, and endeavour to circulate such Bibles among persons, who, as we all assert, are in great need of the Scriptures,—I mean our Roman Catholic Brethren in those countries,—they will immediately say to you, "This *may* be an *English* Bible; but it is not the Bible of Christendom.

* See Ecclus. Prolog. "My grandfather Jesus, when he had much given himself to the reading of the *Law* and the *Prophets*, and the other Books of our Fathers (τὰ ἄλλα βιβλία) was *drawn on* also himself to write something pertaining to learning and wisdom." See also Ecclus. xlv. 5, concerning Moses; Ecclus. xlvii. 8, concerning David; xlvii. 15, concerning Solomon; xlix. 6—10, on Jeremiah, Ezekiel, and the Twelve Prophets.

† 1 Tim. i. 5. ‡ Rom. xiv. 13. 1 Cor. x. 32. 2 Cor. vi. 3.

§ 2 Cor. xii. 19. Eph. iv. 29. 1 Cor. x. 31.

It excludes Books which the Eastern and Western Churches have never ceased to read, from the earliest times to this hour."

You may, perhaps, reply, that the Apocrypha contains unsound doctrine, and questionable history. But to this they will oppose the authority and practice of the Church. They will ask you, "*Whom* shall we believe? You, or Eighteen Centuries? Nay, which of the two shall we believe, you, or your own Church? You vilify the Apocrypha: your Church reads it; she lauds it in her Articles, which you, perhaps, have subscribed; she cites it in her Homilies, which you would have us receive. Either, therefore, you or your Church are in error. Either your Bible or your Prayer Book is wrong. Choose which alternative you will; it is indifferent to us. Return then to your homes. First reconcile yourselves to your Church; make your Prayer Book tally with your Bible; and then come and evangelize us!"

Such, my beloved brethren, would be the language which, under the circumstances supposed, we must be prepared to hear from every well-instructed persons in those countries.*

Let me also observe, as a most important point, that by rejecting the Apocrypha, which has now been read in our own Church, and in the Universal Church, for so many hundred years, we should, in fact, be guilty of the very same sin with which we charge the Church of Rome.

What is that?

It is the imposition of *new terms* of Communion, unknown to the *Catholic* Church. *If*, indeed, the reading of the Apocrypha can be shown to be sinful, then let it be rejected by all means; for we are no advocates for peace without truth. But this has never been proved; and the fact of its being read by the Church for so many centuries will satisfy most persons, to say the least, that it may be read without offence.

* See Appendix D.

And if so, then comes in the obligation upon us,—and a most solemn obligation it is,—not to *impose any new term of* Communion, by which the peace of the Church may be disturbed, and a rent made in the body of Christ. It matters little whether the new term consists in *addition* or *subtraction*. The new term of Communion which *Rome* imposes is the *reception* of the Apocrypha as *inspired;* the new term which *we* should impose would be the total *rejection* of the Apocrypha. *Both* of these two courses are schismatical. I do not intend to say that the rejection of the Apocrypha is, in itself, abstractedly speaking, in any degree to be compared with the canonization of it; but what I mean is, that there is a breach of Christian unity in both cases; and *nothing profiteth without charity;** and wilful schism is a great sin. It is clear, then, that by banishing the Apocrypha, we should imitate Rome; we should impose a *new Bible* as a term of Communion; and instead of doing all in our power, that the religion of Christ *may have free course and be glorified,*† we should make the Bible a stumbling-block to Christianity.

At three different epochs in the History of the Church of England the Apocryphal Books were the object of violent attacks from parties who preferred their own private opinions to the judgment and practice of the Church. I allude to the Hampton Court Conference at the commencement of the reign of King James the First; the Savoy Conference at the Restoration of King Charles the Second; and again, to the abortive attempt made for a religious comprehension, as it was called, at the era of the Revolution of 1688. The parties to whom I refer strove to eject the Apocrypha from the Churches and Bibles of England. Happily their attempts were frustrated: and thus it is, that, by the wonderful Providence of God overruling our own devices against

* 1 Cor. xiii. 1—3. † 2 Thess. iii. 1.

ourselves, the Church of England at the present day occupies a glorious position, from which she looks back upon the Past with thankfulness, and on the Future with hope.

II. We have thus, as in duty bound, dwelt on the evils which would have arisen from the *rejection* of the Apocrypha. We now pass on to consider those which result from the reception and obtrusion of it as *inspired.*

1. To impute to God what does not belong to Him is an offence no less than to deny Him His honour due; and no Church can hope for His blessing, if it is wilfully guilty of this sin. Such an act must bring its own chastisement.

2. Again: the Great Head of the Church desires and commands that all the members of His mystical Body should be joined together in unity. Violations of Church-unity are sins against Christ. The adoption and imposition of any new term of Church Communion, especially in so solemn a matter as the Word of God, is a grievous breach of Unity, and consequently is a heinous offence against Christ. And a Church which is guilty of this sin must, in this respect, be the object of His displeasure, and may look to be visited with His wrath.

3. Besides; one of the main functions of the Church of God is, and ever has been, to be a faithful Keeper of His Word. The Church of Rome has corrupted that Word by canonizing the Apocrypha. She has thus proved herself faithless. And if she is not trustworthy in this prime and paramount duty of a Church, who can be excused in surrendering himself to her guidance? "When the blind lead the blind shall they not both fall into the ditch?"*

4. Further: it is evident that the canonization of the Apocrypha greatly impairs the efficacy of a Church in her *missionary* character.

No Church which isolates herself by imposing new terms

* Matt. xv. 14.

of communion can do the work of the Church Catholic. She may, perhaps, make proselytes to herself; but she cannot incorporate men as sound members in that Church which is and ever will be one and the same in faith.

Now, the reception of the Apocrypha *as inspired*, which was never received *as such* by Christ and His Apostles, or by the Church after them, and the making such a reception an article of Faith, and a term of Communion, is virtually, as far as it goes, an act of self-excommunication, and by consequence an abdication of Apostleship.

5. Let us consider also how the reception of the Apocrypha as inspired affects the relations of a Church, so receiving it, to the *Jews*.

Our Blessed Lord says that "Jerusalem shall be trodden down of the Gentiles, until the times of the Gentiles be fulfilled."* The *Conversion of the Jews* may therefore be regarded as the *consummation of* the work of the Christian Church on earth. It will be her last labour of love on the eve of the Sabbath of Eternity.

The capacity, therefore, of a Church for the performance of *this* glorious work is one of the best criterions of her faithfulness. A Church which has disqualified herself for *this* office, and disfranchised herself from this privilege, cannot be a sound Church; for she cannot aid in realizing God's gracious designs to His *ancient People*, and cannot therefore be approved by Him.

Now, you will bear in mind that the ancient Christian Apologists,—for instance, Justin Martyr and St. Augustine,†—relied much on such arguments as the following in their discussions with the *Jews*.

* Luke xxi. 24.

† Judæi sunt Notarii, Librarii, Capsarii, Scriniarii, Bajuli Christianorum. See Justin Martyr, and St. Augustine in Appendix. C. (*g*) (*h*) (*i*) (*k*) (*l*).

We Christians prove our cause, they said, from the Old Testament, that is, from Books which you Jews cannot allege that *we* have fabricated or tampered with; for we have received these Books from *you*. We show the truth of our Religion from those writings which we derive from you, our bitterest enemies; and which you, we allow, have guarded with scrupulous fidelity. We acknowledge, in the words of that noble *Hebrew of the Hebrews*,* the great Apostle St. Paul, that *to you were committed the oracles of God*,† and that you *have received the lively oracles to give unto us*.‡ Yes, you bear in your hands the divine title-deeds of Him whom you have crucified. And from them we prove His Messiahship. We require no other evidence than what your Scriptures afford. You, therefore, have done, and are still doing, the work of Clerks and Notaries, of Roll-keepers and Registrars for us.§ Nay more; by a just act of Divine retribution, you, by your *dispersion* into all lands, and by your *public reading* of the Old Testament in your synagogues every Sabbath day in all the world, have been the Heralds —yea, without your knowledge and against your will have been, and still are, in a certain sense, the Apostles and Evangelists—of Him whom you have *taken and by wicked hands have crucified and slain*.‖ And now, like a wandering Cain of near twenty centuries, you, by your vagrant condition and miserable aspect, and by the mark set upon you, by God, preach the innocence of your brother Abel, that Good Shepherd whose blood you have shed; and you prove to the world that the offering which He made for the sins of all men on the altar of the Cross has been graciously accepted by God.

You may ask, perhaps, How is it, if you bear in your hands the Old Testament, and if the Old Testament preaches Christ, and if Jesus be the Christ, that you did not receive

* Phil. iii. 5. † Rom. iii. 2. ‡ Acts vii. 38.
§ See above, Note †, on the preceding page. ‖ Acts ii. 23.

Him? Here, we reply, is another proof of the truth of those Scriptures, and of His Messiahship; for your unbelief, and your rejection of the Messiah, is plainly *predicted* in those very Books of the Old Testament which you bear in your hands. *Lord, who hath believed our report?**

"Those things which God before hath showed by the mouth of all His prophets, that Christ should suffer, He hath so fulfilled."†

But, thanks be to God, it is prophesied also in the same Books, that the blessed time is approaching when the veil will be taken from your hearts. As the Prophet says, "The children of Israel shall abide many days without a King, without a Prince, without a Sacrifice, without an image, without an Ephod, and without Teraphim; afterward shall the children of Israel return and seek the Lord their God, and shall fear the Lord and His goodness in the latter days.‡ They shall look on Him whom they pierced."§ And the divine Apostle of Christ takes up the joyful strain, and thus proclaims the gracious promise of God: "I would not, brethren, that ye should be ignorant of this mystery, that blindness in part is happened to Israel until the fulness of the Gentiles be come in; and so all Israel shall be saved."‖

Therefore, in accordance with these prophecies, we call upon you to awake, and to turn to the Lord your God; we implore you to join with us in fulfilling God's designs proclaimed in His own Word, so that, by your reception into the Church, which was purchased by the blood of His dear Son, and which is the *true Zion*, *the Jerusalem from above*, *the mother of us all*, the mercy of the Lord may appear to all, and the earth be *filled with His knowledge as the waters cover the sea.*¶

* Isa. liii. 1.
† Acts iii. 18. Luke xxiv. 25—27.
‡ Hosea iii. 4, 5.
§ Zech. xii. 10.
‖ Rom. xi. 25, 26.
¶ Isa. xi. 9.

Of such a kind was the language of the Ancient Christian Fathers to the people of *Israel.*

But observe how the strength of this glorious appeal in behalf of Christianity is paralyzed, how the melody of its holy music is untuned, by the obtrusion of the Apocryphal Books as inspired.

Once receive and impose the Apocryphal Books as inspired, and you can no longer say, with the ancient Fathers of the Church, that you prove Christianity against the Jews, from the Books which the *Jews* receive as inspired. For they do *not* receive the Apocrypha. Indeed, as was before said, the Jews, mistaking the language of Rome for that of the Catholic Church, urge it as an *objection* against Christianity, that it has *added* to the Word of God *other* books of *human* composition, and that it affirms these books to be of *equal authority* with it, and that it requires all Christians to receive them.

Nor is this all. If we impose the Apocrypha as inspired, then, so far from listening to our appeal, the Jews would turn round upon *us*, and say, Your own Scriptures recognize *us* as the divinely-appointed depositories of the Word of God. Your Apostle Paul says that *to us were committed the oracles of God.** Your Messiah says that *we* have *Moses and the Prophets.*† He worshipped and preached in our synagogues. He acknowledged *our* Canon of Scripture. But your Apocryphal Books were no part of *our* sacred deposit. They were never admitted into our Holy of Holies. So far, then, from proving your Gospel from our Scriptures, you stand convicted by your own Gospel of corrupting our Scriptures. You are condemned by your own Prophet. We leave you to Him. First agree with Him whom you adore as Christ, and then come to us and preach Christianity.

Thus, my brethren, we perceive that, by the canonization

* Rom. iii. 2. † Luke xvi. 29.

of the Apocryphal Books, the Church of Rome, instead of promoting God's glory by aiding in the fulfilment of His gracious design for the restoration of the Jews, has done much to embarrass and impede that glorious work. She has made the Christian Church *appear* to be in contradiction with its ancient self and with its Divine Founder. She has thrown a stumbling-block in the way of God's ancient people, and has made their darkness more thick, and their hearts more hard. She has incapacitated herself from taking any part in their conversion. The veil must be taken from her own eyes before she can make the least movement in taking the veil from the heart of the Jews. She must allow herself to have been in error, before she can teach the truth. She must rescind the decrees of Trent, before she can preach the Gospel of Christ. The reformation or destruction of Rome will, in all human probability, precede the conversion of the Jews.*

Therefore, in fine, my beloved brethren, looking upon the work which the Church of Christ has yet to perform in the propagation of the Gospel both among Jews and Gentiles, we have infinite reason for thankfulness to Almighty God for watching over the Church of England with the eyes of His mercy, and for guiding her by His wisdom in the right way, neither swerving to the right hand nor to the left; so that she is now in a condition to preach the glad tidings of the Gospel to the whole world, and to fulfill the merciful designs of the great Bishop of our souls, for the fetching

* The Jews have a remarkable tradition, that "when Rome is destroyed, then will be the redemption of Israel;" and that "whatever their Prophets have said concerning the destruction of Edom, will be verified with regard to Rome;" and that in "the sixth millenary period of the world, Rome will be destroyed and the Jews restored." See Kimchi ad Obad. and in Esa. xxiv. R. Abrah. Sebah. in Gon. 1. Targum ad Ihren. iv. 22. Vitring. in Apoc. xviii. 6. See some interesting materials on this topic in Mede's Works, Book V. cap. viii. p. 902. The Roman Editors have erased these testimonies.

home of the people of the earth who are still scattered like sheep upon the mountains of ignorance and unbelief, and of bringing them together into one fold, under one Shepherd, Jesus Christ our Lord.

Thanks be to Almighty God that He has given us visible tokens of His Divine Favour, and of His gracious Will that the Church of England should go on and prosper in this blessed enterprise. He has endued her with increased power for discharging this great work, to which she has been called by the natural position, the commercial activity, and the colonial possessions of our country. In 1847 we had already seen twelve Bishoprics founded in our colonies within the preceding twelve years; and the erection of four additional Sees in our foreign dependencies at the commencement of that year, and of three other Sees since that time, are eventful circumstances, which we hail with joy as happy auguries that the Shechinah of the Divine Glory is with us.

Yet, some there are, who, instead of looking with gladness and gratitude on these blessed signs of God's goodness, would turn with yearning hearts in other directions, and would speak coldly and timidly of the graces and hopes of their spiritual Mother; as if they even thought it a merit not to despair of the Church of England! What! Despair of the Church of England? Despair of a Church which has the Word and Sacraments pure and entire, and an Apostolic Ministry to dispense them? We must, then, despair of Christianity.

The Church of England has the Word of God to preach, and, thanks be to God, she has never disqualified herself from preaching it. She holds the Bible in her hands pure and unadulterated. She opens it to the eyes of the world. She has not thrown herself out of the Communion of the ancient people of God, by *adding* to the ancient Scriptures; nor, has she set herself against the authority, and cut herself off from the Communion of the Universal Church of

Christ, by *withdrawing* the due and accustomed reverence from those other Books which have ever been publicly held in esteem by the great body of Christians, as fraught with wise precepts and holy examples, and completing the history of God's providential dealings with His Church, in her interval of patient hope and trial between the Old Testament and the New.

Thus, like the great Missionary Apostle, while she makes no compromise of the Truth, she treads in the paths of Peace; *She is made all things to all men, that she may by all means save some.*

Let me specially exhort you, my younger brethren, to imitate her spirit. Pray to God that you may be like-minded with her. Be thankful to Him that you have here the privilege of being trained in one of her great schools of the Prophets; use aright the blessings which you here enjoy. Then, if you are true to her, and to yourselves,—if you unite Evangelical Faith with Apostolic Order and Catholic Love, you will have the glorious privilege of advancing the work of the Church on earth, and of sharing her bliss in Heaven.

LECTURE V.

Is. viii. 16.

"*Bind up the testimony, seal the law among My disciples.*"

THE New Testament is hidden in the Old, and the Old is displayed in the New; each is in harmony with the other, and the same God is Author of them both.

In the preceding Discourses, it has been my purpose to state the reasons for which we receive the Books of the OLD TESTAMENT as the Word of God; and my design, in the present and following Lectures, is to treat of the Canon of the NEW TESTAMENT, and to show the grounds on which we acknowledge those Books, which are contained in the volume bearing that name, to be a part of the divinely appointed Rule of Faith and Practice, and, therefore, to be of equal authority with the Canonical Books of the Old Testament.

The Canon of the Old Testament, as we have seen, is authorized by Christ Himself, who acknowledged all the Books, of which it consists, to be the Word of God, and referred His hearers to them as such; and it will be my endeavour to prove that we have the same Divine sanction for the Canon of the New. CHRIST is the great *Householder who bringeth forth out of His divine Treasure things New and Old.** *Both* Testaments bear the impress of His signet;

* Matt. xiii. 52. Lactant. iv. 20. In utroque Testamento Idem Testator, CHRISTUS.

He says of both alike, *Bind up the Testimony, seal the Law among My Disciples.*

Let us join in prayer to Him, that He would shed on us the beams of that Spirit which illumined His Prophets and Apostles, and enable us to see His presence in His Word, and to believe in our hearts, and acknowledge with our lips, that "all Scripture is given by inspiration of God, and is profitable for doctrine, for reproof, for correction, for instruction in righteousness, that the man of God may be perfect, thoroughly furnished unto all good works."*

Such being our aim, let us first consider the difficulties which have been thrown in the way of this belief; and next, let us examine in detail the evidence by which a sound faith in the inspiration of the constituent parts of the New Testament is shown to be reasonable, and necessary to salvation.

On the present occasion, we will confine ourselves to the former part of this inquiry.

The objections which have been made to the Canonical authority of the New Testament proceed from two quarters. First, from the open enemies of Revelation; and secondly, from those who would make Scripture to depend on the authority of their own Church.

The form taken by these objections is as follows: Jesus Christ, they observe, committed nothing to writing; and none of the Books of the New Testament were written while He was on earth; nor, were they all composed till from ten to sixty years after His Ascension into Heaven. There is no passage in the New Testament which specifies the names and number of the Books which compose the Christian Scriptures, and assures us of their Inspiration; and, even if there were, such passage would require some independent guarantee of its own veracity.

* 2 Tim. iii. 16, 17.

Again; it is said, we possess writings of eminent Christian Teachers, who were either companions or scholars of the Apostles, namely, the Apostolic Fathers, as they are called, Barnabas, and Clement, and Hermas, the friends and fellow-labourers of St. Paul, and of Ignatius and Polycarp, the Disciples of St. John. One of these, Barnabas,* is called an *Apostle*† in Scripture; three of the other four were Christian Bishops. Now, in their writings, it is alleged,‡ we have little notice taken of the New Testament; the names of the Evangelists are not once mentioned in them; whereas, it might surely have been expected, that, if the New Testament had been received as inspired, in the age of the Apostolic Fathers, they would have made copious citations from it.

Still, further; though it was of the greatest importance that the Church should possess full assurance concerning the momentous question, *what* Books are inspired, and what are *not?* yet, we find, that, even in the third, fourth, and fifth centuries, certain Churches entertained doubts concerning the inspiration of *some* Books of the New Testament; and we do *not* find, that any Catalogue of all the inspired Books was made by any Council of the Church, till late in the fourth century, when such lists were published by the Synods of Laodicea and Carthage;§ and then, it is said, but *not till then*, the Canon of the New Testament was finally fixed and established.

From these allegations the following conclusions are derived.

1. On the one hand, they who do not wish well to Chris-

* For argument's sake the Epistle extant under the name of St. Barnabas is here supposed to be genuine; it is certainly of primitive times.

† Acts xiv. 14.

‡ Bolingbroke's Works, Letter V. vol. i. p. 177.

§ Hobbes' Leviathan, pt. iii. c. 33. Toland's Amyntor, pp. 47, 56, 64. See the citations in Leland's View, i. p. 36, ed. 1798. i. p. 50. Hickes' Treatises, i. p. 73, Oxf. 1847.

tianity would thence infer that the *doctrines* of the Gospel are questionable, since the Inspiration of the documents which contain them, was, they say, so long a matter of doubt.

2. On the other hand, they who elevate their own Church to a dignity higher than the Bible, having first persuaded *themselves* that their own Church is the Mother and Mistress of *all* Churches,* would fain persuade us that Scripture *derives* its authority entirely from their Church; and that, therefore, Holy Scripture cannot be a *sufficient* Rule of Faith.

The Church, they say, did not know what Scripture was, for three centuries after it was written, which could not have been the case, if Scripture were the Rule of Faith. Nor is this all. They next proceed to say, that, if the Church,—by which they mean the Church of *Rome*,—was able to *give*† divine authority in the fourth century to Books, which had existed from the first, there can be no *limit* to her knowledge and power; and, therefore, if we wish to believe in the inspiration of the New Testament, we must *also* believe implicitly whatsoever the Church of Rome has hitherto propounded, or may *hereafter propound*, as necessary to everlasting salvation.

Such difficulties as these, my brethren, have been thrown in the way of a sound belief in the Inspiration of the New Testament; and the fact that some of these objections have been confidently repeated‡ in our own days, and have led to

* Perrone de Locis Theol. p. ii. c. 1. Scripturæ Canon non ab unâ Ecclesiâ constitui debet, si Ecclesia illa non esset omnium Ecclesiarum Mater et Magistra. Porro Ecclesia *Romana*, cum privilegio fruatur primatûs in universam Ecclesiam, suâ potuit auctoritate constituere verum Scripturarum Canonem. See also above, p. 20.

† See above, p. 20, and the passages quoted in Letters to Gondon. p. 83 (3rd ed.), and Sequel (2nd ed.), pp. 85, 96.

‡ Dr. Milner's End of Controversy, Letter xi. "Was this abrogation of the First Rule of Christianity deferred till the Canon of Scripture

the most disastrous results, would of itself be a sufficient reason to us for a careful examination of this subject: even if it were not essential that *all* Christians of *every* age should fully understand the grounds on which the Scriptures of the New Testament, together with the Old, are to be received as the entire and unerring Word of Almighty God.

Let us now examine these allegations.

First, we allow that no Catalogue of the books of the New Testament is found in the extant decrees of any *Council* of the Church more ancient than those of Laodicea and Carthage, toward the close of the fourth century. But, waiving the argument that the decrees of many earlier Councils have been lost, and that such catalogues may have existed in them,* we affirm, and shall proceed to prove, that the books of the New Testament had been received as inspired not only long before that age, but in and from the time in *which they were written;* and that those two Councils, in publishing these lists, did not imagine, that they were making, or *could make*, any Book to be Canonical which was not Canonical before. They did not intend to *enact* any thing new but only to *declare* what was *old;* just as the Church of England, in the sixteenth century, when she published a list

was fixed at the end of the *fourth century?*"—Newman's Essay on the Development of Christian Doctrine, p. 160. "On what ground do we receive the Canon as it comes to us but on the authority of the Church of the *fourth and fifth centuries?* The *Church* of *that era decided*—not merely bore testimony, but passed a judgment on former testimony—decided that certain books were of authority. We receive that decision as true; that is, we virtually apply to a particular case the doctrine of her infallibility." See also p. 167. "If (in the first three centuries) the Imperial Power checked the *development* of Councils, it availed also for keeping back the power of the *Papacy*. The Creed, the *Canon*, in like manner remained undefined. The Creed, the *Canon*, the Papacy, the Œcumenical Councils all *began* to *form*, as soon as the Empire relaxed its tyrannous oppression of the Church."

* See Bp. Kaye's Tertullian, p. 314, ed. 1826.

of the Canonical Books of the Old Testament in her Sixth Article, did not pretend to *give* any *new* authority to those Books, but only affirmed what the Church had believed concerning them *from the beginning*.

The Inspiration of the New Testament was recognized as soon as it was written.

1. In proof of this it may be observed, that, in the public Council Chambers, in which the ancient Synods of Christendom met, a Royal Throne* was set in the midst, and the Sacred Volume of the FOUR GOSPELS was placed upon it, as a visible image of Christ's presence, and as a divine rule, by which all their decrees were to be directed. It is expressly recorded of the most illustrious Council of the Church, that of Nicæa, which was held forty years *before* that of Laodicea, that it had before its eyes the *Books* of the *Evangelists*, *Apostles*, and *Prophets;* and that its decisions were founded on the written Word of Inspiration.† The insertion of the words, "*according to the Scriptures*," in the Nicene Creed, is very significant of this fact.

* S. Cyril, in his Apologetic Discourse to Theodosius, describing the Council of Ephesus, says (Labbe, Concil. iii. p. 1044,) "The Sacred Synod being assembled in Mary's Church, had Christ Himself for their Head; for the Holy Gospel was on a solemn Throne preaching as it were to the venerable Prelates, 'Judge ye right judgment.'"

† Constantine, in his Speech to the Nicene Fathers (Theodoret, i. 7,) says, that they "have the Doctrine of the Holy Spirit in *writing* (ἀνάγραπτον,) for (he adds) the Books of the Evangelists and Apostles, and the oracles of the ancient Prophets teach us clearly and thoroughly (σαφῶς ἐκπαιδεύουσι) what we ought to believe concerning God. Wherefore (he continues) let us lay aside all hostile contention, and let us *decide* our *controversies* from the *Divinely Inspired Books*." In his letter to Eusebius, Bishop of Cæsarea (Socrat. i. 7,) the Emperor announces his decree for the erection of Additional Churches at Constantinople, and for the writing out of Fifty Copies of the Divine Scriptures (θείων γραφῶν) for the use of the Church. He thus endeavoured to repair the injury inflicted by Diocletian in the destruction of Churches and Bibles.

2. Again; although it is allowed that no *Synodical Catalogues*, earlier than the fourth century, are now extant, of the writings of the New Testament, yet, we must remember, that many such Catalogues of those writings *are* found in the works of eminent Fathers, both of the Eastern and Western Church, *anterior* to that time.

It must also be remembered, that these Fathers set down these lists, not as *new* documents, but as *received* by them, through uninterrupted transmission, from the times of the Apostles.* These Catalogues, therefore, embody the belief, not only of the Church of the third and second centuries, but of the first; they contain the testimony of the *Apostolic Churches* to the Inspiration of the Books of the New Testament.

3. Yet further. Even the bitterest foes of Christianity have been converted by God into witnesses of this Truth. The fiercest persecution which the Church has yet been called to endure, was that which raged throughout the Roman world at the beginning of the fourth century, under the Emperor Diocletian, who strained every nerve to exterminate Christianity. He imagined that the best means for effecting his impious purpose would be to destroy the Houses of God and the copies of the Word of God. Therefore he levelled the Churches with the dust, and ordered diligent search to be made in all parts of the Empire for Volumes of the Christian *Scriptures*. These, when found, were committed to the flames.† It is evident, therefore, that it was

* Origen ap. Euseb. vi. 25, refers to "the *ancients* (οἱ ἀρχαῖοι;) and Eusebius says he sets down his own Canon according "to *ecclesiastical tradition*" (iii. 25;) and S. Athanasius ascribes his "to the *eye-witnesses* and *ministers* of the word *from the beginning*" (Epist. Festal.;) so S. Cyril (Cateches. iv. 35.) attributes his Canon to "the *Apostles* and *ancient Bishops*;" and Ruffinus, in Symbol. p. 26, says, "These are the Books of the Old and New Testament, which according to the tradition *of our fathers* are believed to be inspired by the Holy Ghost."

† Euseb. H. E. viii. 2. Lactant. De Mort. Persecut. c. xii.

a fact notorious even to *Pagans*, that *certain Books* were revered by Christians, and that in them the religion of Christians was contained. The New Testament, we say, was known even to Diocletian, as the Old had been to Antiochus Epiphanes;* and Diocletian treated the New as Antiochus had treated the Old, and with very similar results.

It is also certain that those Christians who were then guilty of surrendering copies of the sacred or *Divine Books*,† as they were called, to the imperial emissaries, in order that their own lives might be spared, were regarded by their brethren as Apostates; they were called *Traditores*, or Traitors, for this act of surrender, and were visited with the heaviest penalties by the Church.‡

Hence it is clear that certain Evangelical Writings must have been then generally recognized as distinct from all *other* compositions, and as constituting a definite collection. And this, as we shall afterwards see, was no other than the New Testament received by us at this day.

Thus, the *fierceness of man* has been *turned to the praise of God*;§ and the endeavours of Satan to subvert Christianity have served more fully to authenticate the Scriptures on which Christianity rests. Even Antiochus and Diocletian have become witnesses of the Inspiration of Holy Scripture.

4. Still more. The Arch-enemy of mankind has ever laboured to destroy the Gospel, not only by open assault, but by secret plots; He has attacked the Church by foes *within* as well as *without*, by heresy as well as by persecution.

* See above, Lect. II. p. 39.

† "Libri Deifici." See the Passio of S. Felix in Baluzii Miscell. ii. p. 77. S. Aug. Brevic. Collat. cum Donatistis, c. xv. c. 17.

‡ Concil. Arelat. (A. D. 314.) can. 13. Credner, Geschichte des Canons: Halle, 1847, p. 63. Hooker, V. lxii. 7. The controversy of the Church with the Donatists turned on the question whether Cæcilianus had been ordered by a Traditor or not.

§ Ps. lxxvi. 10.

He has not only gone about roaring as the *Lion*, but he lurks in crafty ambush as the *Dragon*.* But Heretics as well as Persecutors, have been made by God to advance the cause of the Church. Christ, the Divine Conqueror, has *gone both upon the Lion and the Adder; the young Lion and the Dragon He treadeth under His feet*.† He has converted the insidious malice, as well as the cruel rage, of the Evil One into occasions and instruments for the promotion of His Glory, and the Establishment of His Truth. Even in primitive times, *there were false teachers, who privily brought in damnable heresies;*‡ and they could not propagate their false doctrines except they stifled the true. What, therefore, did they do? They mutilated or rejected the Christian Scriptures. Some of them endeavoured to combine Christianity with Judaism, and to make a composite religion of the two;§ some would have separated Jesus of Nazareth from Christ the Son of God.‖ They, therefore, rejected those parts of the New Testament, which were hostile to their heresies. Others received the New Testament, but rejected the Old;¶ others recognized both Testaments, but perverted them by false interpretations.** Others composed Apocryphal Writings in support of their erroneous

* S. Aug. in Joan. x. Non cessat Inimicus persequi. Inde dictus *Leo* et *Draco*. Leo propter apertam iram, Draco propter occultas insidias. Sed quid dicitur Christo? Conculcabis *Leonem* et *Draconem*, Ps. xci. 13.

† Ps. xci. 13.

‡ 2 Pet. ii. 1.

§ The Ebionites and Nazarenes.

‖ The Cerinthians, Alogi, and others.

¶ The Carpocratians, Marcionites, and Manichæans, Hieron. adv. Pelag. 1. 2. The former, however, received only part of the New Test. Iren. i. 27; iii. 12. Tertullian. de Carne Christi, c. 2, 3. adv. Marcion. iv. 1—6.

** The Valentinians, Tertullian. Præscr. Hæret. c. 38, and others. Iren. iii. c. 12.—Priscillianists, August. de Hæres. c. 70.

doctrines,* and circulated *them*, as of equal authority with the Books of the New Testament.

But what was the result of all these pernicious devices? They aroused the Church and made her lift up her *voice as a trumpet*,† they made her *blow the silver trumpet of her holy Convocations*,‡ to condemn their authors in her Synods, as enemies of God, and of His truth.§

Thus, the rejection or mutilation of Scripture by Heretics gave occasion for the vindication, assertion, and manifestation of Scripture by the Church; and has been among the means employed by Divine Providence for assuring successive generations, that the New Testament, as handed down to them, was received by the primitive Church as the Word of God.

But, it may be said, these statements do not prove that the Books which *we now* receive are *identical* in *substance* with those which were *then* received; and that *our* New Testament was recognized by the Primitive Church.

We, therefore, proceed to observe, that we possess an uninterrupted series of writings from the Apostolic times to the present day; and that these contain quotations from the Books of the New Testament; and that we have Commentaries upon it, reaching downward to us, in unbroken succession, from the third and fourth centuries; and that many of these Commentaries exhibit the *text* of these Books; and that we have hundreds of ancient Manuscripts of these Books, from all parts of the world; that we have ancient Versions of them in numerous languages; and that these various and independent witnesses coincide with each other,

* Bardesanes, Epiphan. Hær. 66; and the Gnostics generally. Iren. i. 17.

† Isa. lviii. 1. ‡ Num. x. 2.

§ Tertullian. de Baptism. c. 17. The case of the author of the Acts of Paul and Thecla. Hieron. Vir. Illust. in Lucâ says, that he was convicted by St. John. See also Can. Apost. lxii.

and concur in testifying the fact, that the Scriptures of the New Testament existed in primitive times as they exist now, and have been transmitted, pure and entire, from the hands of the Apostles to our own.

5. Nor is this all. The Books of the New Testament were addressed, for the most part, not to *private* individuals, but to *Public Societies;* to particular Churches, and to the Church at large. The Authors of these Books enjoined that they should be publicly *read.** In the annals of the early Church we often meet with mention of Ecclesiastical Officers, called *Anagnostæ*, or *Readers,*† whose duty it was to recite the Sacred Scriptures in the ears of the people in the Church. We find, also, from early Christian writers,‡ that the *reading* of the GOSPELS and EPISTLES of the NEW TESTAMENT, was an essential part of the Public Worship of God in the Christian Church, just as the reading of the LAW and the PROPHETS of the OLD TESTAMENT was a part of the Public Worship in the Synagogue.

By this public reading, the Books of the New Testament were *canonized as soon as they were written;* thus they

* Col. iv. 16. 1 Thess. v. 27. Their communication to all is implied by 2 Thess. iii. 14.

† For instance, Cyprian, Epist. xxiv. xxxiii. xxxiv., and before him Tertullian, Præscr. 41, "Hodie diaconus qui cras *Lector.*"—Apol. 39. Coimus ad Literarum Divinarum commemorationem.

‡ Justin Martyr, Apol. i. c. 66, 67, p. 83. ed. Bened. See also Epist. ad Diognet. p. 502. Tertullian Apol. 39, de Anima, 9. Præscr. Hæret. c. 36. Percurre ecclesias apostolicas apud quas ipsæ adhuc cathedræ Apostolorum suis locis præsident, apud quas *authenticæ literæ* eorum *recitantur, sonantes* vocem, repræsentantes faciem *uniuscujusque.* And speaking of the primitive Church of Rome, he adds, "Legem et Prophetas cum Evangelicis et Apostolicis Literis miscet." See also adv. Marcion. iv. 5. Videamus quid *legant* Philippenses. Thessalonicenses, Ephesii; quid etiam Romani de proximo *sonent.* In the ancient Frag. Can., ap. Muratori, occur the expressions, "*legi in* Ecclesiâ," and "*publicari* in Ecclesiâ *populo,*" concerning books of the New Testament.

were every where proclaimed to be divine, and thus they were preserved entire.

Their dissemination into all parts of the world, and the veneration in which they were held, rendered it impossible that they should be altered, either by addition or curtailment; and when any partial alteration was ever attempted, as we have seen it was by heretics, it was condemned as a flagrant crime.

I do not *now* enter into the question, whether there are not *some* Books in the New Testament, concerning the inspiration of which doubts were entertained in *some portions of the Church* in early times. This inquiry is reserved to a more suitable place in our argument. Let us now pass on to consider the remaining objection stated at the commencement of this Discourse.

Christ, it is said, wrote nothing. No Book of the New Testament was composed while He was on earth; and in the writings of the Apostolic Fathers, friends and scholars of the Apostles, little notice is taken of the Books of the New Testament; which, it was alleged, would not have been the case, if they had been received as inspired in the Apostolic age. What is to be said here?

It is quite true, that as far as we know, nothing was committed to writing by our blessed Lord Himself. It is also certain that no Book of the New Testament was written till some years after His Ascension; and that the Books of the New Testament were not all written till the close of the first century.

And, let me add, these facts afford another proof of their Inspiration.

1. For, suppose the Founder of a religion to give an account *in his own person* of the miracles he professes to have wrought; or, suppose him to publish a report of the moral and spiritual doctrines which he delivered: it is plain, that

the strength of the historical evidence would rest on his own credibility; nor would it be wonderful, if his own exposition of his doctrines were found coherent and clear. Thus, for example, the authenticity of the Koran depends on the veracity of Mahomet; and it can found no pretence to be a supernatural revelation on any ground of internal consistency.

But how different is the case of the New Testament! Here we have several writings, not composed by the Founder of Christianity, nor during His sojourn in the world, nor in the vernacular tongue of the Writers; but written in Greek by unlettered Galilæns, many years after their Master had been removed from them; and giving independent accounts of supernatural works, and spiritual discourses on the most abstruse and mysterious subjects! Yet these are found to be all consistent with each other. They are received as the Word of God by innumerable congregations of men contemporary with the Authors themselves. They are preserved entire in a marvellous manner. They have produced wonderful effects—ever generating fresh benefits to the world; every day softening barbarous tribes, and cheering benighted Nations with heavenly light and love.

How, my brethren, can we explain this wonderful phenomenon? Its solution is to be found only in the fulfilment of our Lord's promise to His Apostles; "These things have I spoken unto you being yet present with you; but the Comforter, which is the Holy Ghost, whom the Father will send in My Name, He shall teach you all things, and bring all things to your remembrance whatsoever I have said unto you. When He, the Spirit of Truth is come, He will guide you into all truth, and He will show you things to come:" for which cause they were ordered not to premeditate, when brought before Rulers and Kings, for *it is not ye that speak, but the Holy Ghost.** And again: *These signs shall follow*

* Mark xiii. 11.

*them that believe, they shall speak with new Tongues.** Sceptics *may* give, and have given, other accounts of the matter, but we confidently affirm, that the form and substance of the New Testament can be accounted for by its *Inspiration*, and by *it alone*.†

In further illustration of this statement, let us consider briefly the case of that Apostle, who was employed to contribute more than any other to the writing of the New Testament—St. Paul. He never saw Christ on earth; he was a bitter persecutor of Christianity; humanly speaking, he was of all men the least qualified to preach the Gospel. For some time after his conversion he was suspected and feared by the Christians, and never ceased to be hated by the Jews. Yet he was *chosen* to be the special messenger of the Gospel to the most enlightened nations of the world. The solitudes of Arabia were his school for the Apostleship. He conferred not with flesh and blood; and the persecuting Pharisee emerged into the Christian Saint without any teaching of man.‡ What Cause, my brethren, except that of Truth and of God, would have *chosen*, or could have employed with success, such an Instrument as this? How could St. Paul have effected what he did for the conversion of the world, if he had not been filled with the Holy Ghost,

* Mark xvi. 17.

† Hence Eusebius, H. E. iii. 24, says, "The Apostles were rude in speech; but by *the demonstration of the Holy Spirit* working with them, and by the miraculous power alone of Christ consummated through them, they announced the knowledge of the kingdom of Heaven to all the world. This they did by the assistance of supernatural strength." S. Dionysius of Alexandria (ap. Euseb. iv. 23) *contrasts* the κυριακαὶ γραφαὶ with his own. Compare S. Iren. i. 46, 47, and iii. 1. Theophil. ad Autolyc. iii. p. 124. S. Amphil. S. Chrys. Homil. in Matth. i. Origen. Homil. in Luc. init. de Princ. i. Præf. c. 8. Euseb. iii. 4. S. Hieron. Præf. in Matt. Evang. for ancient assertions of the Inspiration of the New Testament.

‡ Gal. i. 11—24.

and instructed by *visions and revelations of the Lord?** Surely the choice of the instrument, and the marvellous effects which it produced, must rivet our belief that the *excellency of the power of the Gospel* which St. Paul preached, is *not of man, but of God.*†

2. Let us now consider the objection, that little notice is taken by the Apostolic Fathers of the Books of the New Testament.

The preaching of the Apostles and Evangelists, for some years after the Ascension, was only by word of *mouth.* Catechising, or *oral teaching*, was *first necessary* in order to prepare the world for the reception and profitable use of Scripture;‡ and Catechising, as we see from St. Luke's preface to his Gospel, *was* first employed, before the Gospel was written. But we also learn from the same preface, that it was requisite that the Gospel should be *written, in order* that they *who had been* catechised should be more fully instructed in those things which they had heard by *word of mouth.*§ The committal of the Word to *writing* arose too as a consequence from the foresight the writers had of their approaching death,‖ or from their departure to distant lands, or from their imprisonment, or from the circulation of heretical writings; all which circumstances were providentially converted by Almighty God into means of permanent blessing to the Church.

The Apostolic Fathers wrote at that very time when the oral teaching of the Apostles was still sounding in the ears of Christendom. Hence their great value. They represent to us the feelings of the primitive Church as an *audience.* They are an echo of the voice of Christ. They are contem-

* 2 Cor. xii. 1. Eph. iii. 3. † 2 Cor. iv. 7.

‡ Luke i. 4, and 1 John ii. 14. "I have *written* unto you . . . *because* the Word of God abideth in you."

§ Luke i. 4.

‖ 2 Pet. i. 14. Euseb. ii. 15; iii. 24. Epiphan. Hæres. lxix. c. 23.

porary and independent witnesses of Scripture; they show that what is there taught was believed in the Apostolic Church. They give us the general effect of Christ's teaching; and, in proof of their authenticity, they convey to us some sayings of our Blessed Lord, which are *not* contained in the written Gospel, but are in full harmony with it.* And, even the flaws and blemishes which occur in their works are not without their use; for they remind us, what the *Apostles would* have been, *if* they had *not* been *inspired;* and what *we* ourselves should be, if we had not the *Written Word.*†

But is it really true that these Apostolic Fathers were unacquainted with the books of the New Testament, or that they did not regard them as inspired? Far from it. It is indeed true that their own hearts were full of what they had *heard,*‡ and that they spake mainly from that. And no wonder. Every one is more vividly affected by what he hears than by what he reads. But in all their own writings, if we may so speak, they take the New Testament for

* See Bp. Pearson, Vind. Ignat. i. 43: ii. p. 99, and Lardner, Credibility, i. p. 288. 294; Jones on the Canon, i. 353. sqq.

† The inconveniences to which *oral tradition* is liable, showed themselves even in the Apostolic age; *e. g.* in the popular opinion that St. John should not die, in the diversity of opinions concerning the duration of Christ's ministry, and in the belief of the proximity of the Second Advent: these were *corrected* by Scripture or from Scripture, John xxi. 23. 2 Thess. ii. 2. Concerning the last point, see the details in Lectures on the Apocalypse. These aberrations suggest many reflections concerning the precariousness of tradition at *this late* age, and concerning the necessity of a written Canon.

‡ See the account of Papias, in Euseb. iii. 39, on the relation of oral to written teaching in primitive times. We have in Papias, an example of excess of devotion to *oral* tradition, to which kind of tradition Chiliasm and other errors held by some in our own days, even zealous opponents of *written* tradition, are attributable. See Lectures on the Apocalypse.

granted;* they suppose their readers to be familiar with it; they imitate the Apostolic Epistles in their introductions and salutations, and in their whole tone and treatment of their subject.

To descend to particulars. St. Barnabas† quotes passages from St. Matthew as *Scripture;* St. Clement,‡ writing to the Corinthians, refers them to St. Paul's Epistle; St. Ignatius§ places the Evangelists and Apostles on a par with the Prophets, and speaks of St. Paul's Epistle to the Ephesians;‖ St. Polycarp,¶ the latest of the Apostolic Fathers, refers the Philippians to the Epistle of St. Paul, and confesses that neither he himself, nor any one like him, can come up to the wisdom of the blessed and glorious Apostle. He expresses his confidence that they are well versed in *the Scriptures;*** he declares that whosoever perverts them to their own lusts, is of the devil;†† and he makes numerous citations from the Gospels and Epistles, which he adduces as of equal

* The scantiness of *direct* Scripture citations in the writings of the Apostolic Fathers is justly regarded as a proof of the genuineness of those writings. The *larger* Greek edition of St. Ignatius abounds with Scripture quotations; and if the passages in which the smaller and fewer Greek Epistles differ from the Syriac were interpolations, and were introduced in the third or fourth century, (as some have imagined,) *they* also would doubtless have been interspersed with Scripture texts.

† Cap. 4. compare Matt. xx. 16; xxii. 14. Cap. 5. cp. Matt. ix. 13.

‡ I. 47. "Take into your hands the Epistle of the blessed Paul the Apostle. What wrote he to you in the beginning of his teaching?" (τοῦ εὐαγγελίου, comp. Rom. ii. 16; xvi. 25. 1 Cor. xv. 1. Gal. i. 11; ii. 2.) "Verily he enjoined you spiritually concerning himself, and Cephas and Apollos, because even then, you had made parties among you." (1 Cor. i. 12.)

§ Ad Philad. c. 5. c. 7. c. 9. ad Smyr. c. 7.

‖ Ignat. Epist. ad Ephes. c. xii.

¶ Ad Phil. c. 3, and c. 11. These passages are not noted by Lardner.

** Ad Phil. c. 12.

†† Ad Phil. c. 7. ὃς ἂν μεθοδεύῃ τὰ λόγια τοῦ Κυρίου.

authority with the Old Testament; and finally, his *whole teaching* was *in harmony with the Scriptures.**

Of this we are assured by his disciple, St. Irenæus, the venerable Bishop of Lyons, who thus writes:† "I remember," says he, "the things which took place when I was young, better than those which occurred lately. I recollect well the place in which the holy Polycarp used to sit and speak. I remember his going out and his coming in, his person, and manner of life, and the discourses he made to the people, and how he described his intercourse with the Apostle St. John, and with the rest who had seen the Lord; and how he recited their sayings concerning Christ, His miracles, and His doctrine; and how, having received records from eye-witnesses of the Word of Life, he recounted them *agreeing in every thing with the Scriptures.*‡ These things, through the mercy of God then given me, I used eagerly to hear and write, not on paper, but in my heart; and by God's grace I shall ever ponder them in my mind."

Such is the account which St. Irenæus, the eloquent and learned champion of Christianity, and the holy martyr of Christ, has given of his master Polycarp, Bishop of Smyrna, also a martyr of Christ, and scholar of the blessed Disciple *whom Jesus loved.*

St. Polycarp, as we have said, is the latest of the Apostolic Fathers.§ His Epistle to the Philippians, of which we have spoken, was written about fifteen years after the death of St. John.‖ He connects, as it were, the Apostolic age

* See Jacobson, Patres Apost. p. 599; Lardner's Credibility, i. 327—333. ed. 4to. Lond. 1815.

† Ap. Euseb. v. 20. See also Iren. iii. 3.

‡ πάντα ξύμφωνα ταῖς γραφαῖς.

§ He suffered martyrdom, A. D. 147, according to the calculations of Bp. Pearson; others place his death later, see Jacobson, Patr. Apost. liii.

‖ From cap. xiii. p. 489, ed. Jacobson, it is clear that it was written before the martyrdom of St. Ignatius, *i. e.* before A. D. 116, or A. D. 107,

with the one succeeding it; he introduces us to the period when the sound of the oral teaching of those who had seen the Lord becomes fainter and fainter, till at last it dies away. In proportion as the voice of the Apostles fails, the words of the Scriptures become more and more distinct; they are more and more frequently quoted, as may be seen in the writings of the succeeding Fathers,—Justin Martyr, Tertullian, and Irenæus,—till at length they become all in all. Thenceforth, the Disciples of Christ fixed their eyes, and dwelt with their hearts, on the *written* Testament of their beloved Lord and Master, as children look upon the last will of a dear Parent. For it was the Testament of their Heavenly Inheritance, written by the Spirit of Christ, and sealed with His precious Blood.

Thus, we perceive that the reception of the New Testament, by the primitive Church, as the unerring Word of God, is guaranteed by irrefragable proofs. It is evinced by Catalogues; it is proclaimed by Councils; it is shown by the fury of Persecutors, and by the fraud of Heretics; by the courage of Martyrs, and by the zeal of the Church. It is declared by a continued succession of writers, from the age of the Apostles to our own.

This reception of the New Testament by the primitive Church, must, I think, be allowed by all candid minds, to be an irrefragable proof of its Inspiration. For the Books of the New Testament contain accounts of miracles, stated to have been wrought by the Apostles, and of their speaking with new tongues, and of their predicting future events,—in a word, of their performing those very acts by which Divine Inspiration is *proved*. GOD "bare them witness, both with signs and wonders, and with divers miracles and gifts of the

according to some chronologers. St. John survived to the time of Trajan, (Iren. iii. 1; ii. 22,) who reigned from A. D. 98, to A. D. 117.

Holy Ghost."* Now, the Books in which these accounts are given profess to be inspired;† and they were received and publicly read as such by large congregations of persons, living at *that very time*, and in those *very places*, in which these proofs of Inspiration are affirmed in these Books to have been given. The persons, in whose hearing these books were first read, must have known, whether these miracles were really performed or no. And if these miracles had *not* been performed, they would have rejected these Books as fabulous. But the fact is, they received them as true, and not only as *true*, but as *divine*. This reception, then, this public reading, this canonization of these Books, this divinization of them, if I may so speak, is a contemporaneous and œcumenical testimony to the fact, that these *proofs* of Inspiration were really exhibited‡ by the authors of these Writings, and, by consequence, that their own assertion of their Inspiration is true.

To this testimony, therefore, of the primitive Church, we appeal with confidence; for it is the testimony of Christ Himself.

But we do not stop here. Having received this witness of the Church to the Inspiration and Integrity of the New Testament, we pass *from external to internal* evidence; we examine the *Books themselves;* and the more time and study we bestow upon them, the more our faith in their Inspiration grows; the more we are convinced by the harmony of their parts with each other and with the Old Testament, by the beauty and dignity of their composition, by the nobleness

* Hebr. ii. 4.

† 1 Cor. ii. 4, 5—13; vii. 40; xiv. 36, 37. 1 Thess. i. 5. 2 Tim. iii. 16, compared with Gal. i. 11, 12. Eph. iii. 3. 1 Pet. i. 12; iv. 11. 2 Pet. iii. 2; iii. 16. Rev. iii. 6.

‡ S. Aug. De Civ. Dei, xxii. 6, expresses this argument very briefly and well, Canon Scriptuarum miracula facit ubique recitari . . nec in populis, nisi *credita, legerentur.*

and loveliness of their morality, and by the mysterious sublimity of their doctrines, by their marvellous adaptation to the nature and needs of man, that the Scriptures are not the words of man, but of God; and that they are the full and sufficient Deposit of that Divine Revelation and Supernatural Truth to which the *Church*, "built upon the foundation of the Apostles and Prophets, Jesus Christ Himself being the chief corner stone,"* owes her existence, and on which she depends for her preservation; and, by the grace of the Holy Spirit, who led their writers into *all truth*,† we are firmly settled in the belief that they are indeed the Bread of Life, and are able, by God's mercy, "to make us wise unto salvation, through faith in Jesus Christ."‡

* Eph. ii. 20. 1 Cor. iii. 9. 11. † John xvi. 13.
‡ 2 Tim. iii. 15.

LECTURE VI.

John xxi. 23, 24.

"*Jesus said not unto him, He shall not die, but, If I will that he tarry till I come, what is that to thee? This is the disciple which testifieth of these things, and wrote these things: and we know that his testimony is true.*

It was my endeavour in the last Discourse to state the grounds generally, on which the Books of the New Testament are to be received, as forming, together with those of the Old, the complete divinely-appointed Rule of Christian Faith and Practice; and I now proceed to examine those of the New Testament, *in detail*, and to confirm more specifically, and to develop more fully, what was then asserted with respect to them in their collective character.

On the present occasion my purpose is to speak of the *Historical* Books—that is, of the Four Gospels, and of the Acts of the Apostles: and the question to be considered is—Why are they to be received as the Word of God?

The foundation of Christianity is laid in the belief that the Scriptures, as we possess them, are given by Divine inspiration; and in order that this foundation may stand securely, it must rest on the basis of sound reason. This is the foundation which we would now endeavour, by God's help, to establish, and build up your belief in the authority of the Gospel.

This work, important at all times, is the more urgent at the present day, when all the great questions concerning the relative authority of Scripture and the Church, and their dependent controversies, are opening upon us. If we desire *to be ready to give* to ourselves and *to every man that asketh us, a reason of the hope that is in us*,* we must diligently examine the grounds upon which the Scriptures are to be believed and asserted to be God's Word; and we must be carefully on our guard, not only against the attacks of those who would impugn this truth, but also against the dangerous teaching which places it on a false foundation.

Many there are who teach—indeed all the divines of the Church of Rome who have treated on this subject agree in the doctrine—that belief in the inspiration of Scripture *rests* on the authority of the *present Church*, by which they mean *their own branch* of it. And *they* would inquire of you, my brethren,—On what principle do you receive the Gospels of St. Luke and of St. Mark, who were *not* Apostles, and yet do *not* receive the Epistle of St. Barnabas, who is called an *Apostle* in Scripture, and is there said to have been a *devout man, full of the Holy Ghost?*† On what ground, again, they would ask you, do you receive the Epistle to the Hebrews, whose author is uncertain, and yet not receive the Epistle of Clement, whose name, as St. Paul says, is *written in the book of Life?*‡ And they would have you reply to these questions—that you receive the one, and do *not* receive the other, on the testimony of the Church; by which, as I have said, they mean the Church of *Rome*.

This step being gained, they would then proceed to say, —You owe, then, the Scriptures to the Church; you would not possess them, if she had not given them to you; and therefore if you will not be inconsistent you must listen to all she says; you must not receive her testimony in *one* point, and reject it in *another;* you must believe, unreserv-

* 1 Pet. iii. 15. † Acts xi. 24. ‡ Phil. iv. 3.

edly, whatever she delivers to you, and follow unhesitatingly wheresoever she leads you.

But, my beloved brethren, *we* would build on a very different foundation from this. We do not hesitate to confess that we have received the Scriptures from God through the Ministry of the Church. But the Scriptures are not the Word of the Church, but the Word of God. They owe their authority not to her, but to Him: and he has appointed her to guard the Scriptures which He has delivered to her, and to proclaim to us that they are from Him.

Again, we do not scruple to allow that we know no higher *earthly* authority than the universal Church of Christ. We believe one Catholic and Apostolic Church. We believe her to be the *Spouse and Body of Christ.** We know that Christ says that *the gates of hell shall never prevail against* her, and that *He will be ever* with her, *even to the end of the world.*† But we know also, that the Church of Rome is not the Catholic Church, and therefore we do not receive her testimony as that of the Catholic Church. Yet we do not hesitate to say that even for the *present* Church of *Rome* herself, as far as she still agrees with the universal Church of Christ,—as, for example, in retaining the Lord's Prayer, the Ten Commandments, a Threefold Ministry, the three Creeds, the Christian Scriptures and Sacraments, though grievously marred and mutilated in her hands,—we entertain such feelings as are due to the *truth* of CHRIST, wheresoever it may be found. But then we are compelled to add, that *because* we reverence the teaching of the *Universal Church*, that is, of the Church of all times and especially of the Apostolic times, therefore we *cannot* receive any one of those doctrines by which the Church of *Rome* has corrupted the faith of the Apostles,—we cannot receive the Apocrypha which they did not receive, and command us to receive—lest we should incur the Apostolic anathema,

* Eph. v. 23—33. Rom. xii. 5. † Matt. xvi. 18; xxviii. 20.

"If any man, or even an angel from heaven, preach to you any thing beside what we have preached to you, let him be accursed."*

Holding these principles, we believe that the *external* testimony on which the Scriptures are to be received, is not that of any present portion of the Church, but that of the Universal Church; that is, it is the authority of the Holy Apostles and of Jesus Christ.

We shall now proceed to show that the Historical Books of the New Testament *are* sanctioned, and delivered, and guaranteed to us as the Word of God by *this* testimony.

Here let me first say a few words on the *form* in which these Books are presented to us at this day. They come before us as a *part* of a *Volume*. We see them combined, like the writings of one and the same Author, published at the same time. Perhaps some of you may not have had an opportunity of considering at what periods, and under what circumstances, these Books were published, and by what means they have been preserved to us. Perhaps even our very familiarity with them as we commonly see them, may have occasioned erroneous or imperfect conceptions with respect to them.

Let me, therefore, exhort you to divest yourselves of such notions as a view of these Books, presented to us merely as they exist in our own day, in outward form and fashion like other books, may have produced in your minds. Think not of the Gospels as *parts* of *a printed Book* published at once, but think of them as *separate* compositions, written by different Authors, and published at different *times* and in different *countries*. Think of them as they were seen in the earlier ages of the Church, not as they appear now.

Again, in order to conceive adequate notions of their

* Gal. i. 8, 9. εἴ τις εὐαγγελίζεται παρ' ὃ παρελάβετε ... ἐὰν ἡμεῖς ἢ ἄγγελος ἐξ οὐρανοῦ εὐαγγελίζηται, παρ' ὃ εὐηγγελισάμεθα, ἀνάθεμα ἔστω.

divine dignity, think of them, for example, as they were beheld in that Great Council of the Church in the fourth century, to which we owe the Creed that bears its name, the Council of Nicæa.* Think, I say, of the Holy Gospels, there placed on a Royal Throne, venerated as a visible representation of Christ's august presence, and as the unerring Rule of the Catholic Faith. Behold them there appealed to as a Divine Oracle by the Fathers of that Council, summoned from all parts of Christendom, in an age while the field of the Church was still fresh and sparkling with the spiritual dews which had fallen upon it in gracious abundance on the day of Pentecost.

The venerable Bishops who composed that Council had just escaped from the fiery trial of persecution; and the main endeavour of the Persecutor, who wielded the sword of the Empire of the World, had been to wrest the Gospels from their hands, and to commit the Christian Scriptures to the flames.† But these Fathers of the Church were fully persuaded that these Books were written by the finger of God; and they were willing to seal this belief with their blood, rather than to betray them to the Destroyer.‡

Further: in order to elevate our notions concerning the Gospel to a proper level, it is of great importance to examine the *works* of the Christian Writers of that and the *preceding* centuries. There we see clearly with what a reverential spirit the Church of Christ then treated them. To the minds of some in *our own* days, *their* notions may appear fanciful, and their expressions may sound hyperbolical; but the fault, be assured, is not theirs, but ours. Let us remember that their language declares the judgment of the holiest men of Christendom, who, from their circumstances, were best qualified to pronounce an opinion on this solemn subject; and that they who thus speak, proved their sincerity

* A. D. 325. See above, p. 110. † Ibid.
‡ Ibid. p. 111.

by their zeal for the Gospel, and by their readiness to die in its behalf.

If, then, we would cherish a devout spirit of veneration for these Divine Books, we may profitably remember, that the Christians of *that* period, looking at the holy source and blessed effects of the Four Gospels, spake of them as the Four spiritual Rivers of Paradise, issuing from one Divine holy fount, and watering the Garden of Eden;* that is, coming forth from the Well-spring of Life, irrigating the Christian world by their refreshing and fertilizing streams, and making it *to blossom as the rose*, and to bring forth rich fruits, and golden harvests, to be stored in the garner of heaven.

Again: looking at the origin of the FOUR GOSPELS, and at the Divine attributes of Unity, Omniscience, Omnipotence, and Eternity, which God has in rich measure been pleased to bestow upon them by His Holy Spirit, the Christian Church found a prophetic picture of them in the Four living Cherubim, named from heavenly knowledge, seen by Ezekiel at the river of Chebar.† Like them the Gospels are Four in number; like them they are the Chariot of God *who sitteth between the Cherubim*:‡ like them they bear Him on a winged Throne into all lands: like them they move wherever the Spirit guides them: like them they are marvellously joined together, intertwined with coincidences and differences; wing interwoven with wing, and wheel inwound with wheel; like them they are full of eyes, and sparkle with heavenly light; like them they sweep from heaven to earth, and from earth to heaven, and fly with the lightning's speed, and with the noise of many waters. "Their sound is gone

* S. Cyprian, Ep. 73. See S. Hieron. Procem. in Matth.

† Ezek. i. 5—26, and x. 1—22. S. Iren. iii. 11. § 8. S. Athanas. Synops. Script. p. 55. S. Hieron. in Matth. Procem. Ep. l. ad Paulinum. Præf. Auct. Inc. apud Augustin. in Joann.

‡ Psalm xcix. 1; lxxx. 1; xviii. 10.

out into all lands, and their words unto the end of the world."*

Once more; the Ancient Church recognized the Four Gospels in the Four Living Creatures of the Apocalypse, seen by St. John in heaven, and crying "Holy, holy, holy, Lord God Almighty, which was, and is, and is to come."†

Such, my beloved brethren, were the terms in which the early Church of Christ spoke of the Four Gospels; and from them we may catch some portion of the sacred flame of love and awe which warmed her breast. Nor are these expressions without their use, in assuring us of the important fact, that although, as we have seen, *other* writings were then extant, pretending to evangelical authority, yet it is clear from her language,‡ as now cited, that the Church of Christ rejected those writings, and recognized FOUR GOSPELS, and FOUR only; and these four Gospels were identical in name, in form, and in matter, with those received by ourselves at this day.

In further evidence of their fourfold character, we may observe that one of the earlier Christian writers employed himself in making a Harmony of the Gospels, and, from the name§ which he gave to his work, it is certain, that *four* Gospels, and *four only*, were then received by the Church.

I pass on to remark that, if we trace the four Evangelic streams back toward their source, we find that they are all derived, through *Apostolic* channels, from CHRIST HIMSELF.

* Ps. xix. 4.

† Rev. iv. 4—11. See the authorities cited in Lectures on the Apocalypse, Lect. iv.

‡ See also Origen ap. Euseb. vi. 25. μόνα τέσσαρα. Homil. in Luc. p. 932. Euseb. iii. 25. ἁγία τετρακτύς. S. Hieron. ad Paulin. Quadriga Dom'ni.

§ Tatian, scholar of Justin Martyr. See Euseb. iv. 29, on his *Diatessaron*. On the Harmony of Theophilus Antiochenus, see Hieron. ad Algas, iv. p. 197.

The author of the first Gospel, ST. MATTHEW, was an Apostle of Christ.* He wrote about ten years after the Ascension, for the special use of his own countrymen, and of the Christian Church of Jerusalem, the mother of all Christian Churches, which was first governed by St. James, the Lord's brother, and continued to flourish during the earlier part of the second century.† The *first* written Gospel, then, be it remembered (that is, the first Evangelical Record of Christ's miracles, preaching, death, resurrection, and ascension,) was composed for the use of that very country in which our Lord's life was passed. It was circulated in that very city in which our Lord suffered. This is a striking proof of the confidence of the Apostles in the truth of Christianity. They did not shrink from inquiry, but challenged and courted it. This Gospel, so written, was received as Scripture by the Church at Jerusalem. And this reception and public reading of St. Matthew's Gospel, as not only a true history, but as divinely inspired, in the Church of *Jerusalem at that period*, is one of the strongest evidences that could be given of its Veracity and Inspiration.

ST. MARK wrote his Gospel under the dictation of the Apostle St. Peter,‡ who calls him *his son*§ in the faith: and

* Euseb. iii. 24. S. Hieron. Procem. in S. Matth.

† Till Hadrian's time. Euseb. Dem. Evang. iii. 5.

‡ Iren. iii. 10. 6. Euseb. iii. 39; vi. 14. (from Clem. Alex.) Demon. Evang. iii. 5. Hieron. Script. Eccl. c. i. and c. 8. Tertullian. adv. Marcion. iv. 5. Euthym. Zygab. i. p. 15. Epipham. Hæres. li. 4. St. Peter says (2 Pet. i. 15,) "I will endeavour that *after my departure* (μετὰ τὴν ἐμὴν ἔξοδον) ye may have these things in remembrance." This seems to be a promise fulfilled by the Apostle bequeathing to them *St. Mark's* Gospel, and appears to explain the meaning of the disputed passage of Irenæus, iii. 1, μετὰ τὴν Πέτρου καὶ Παύλου ΕΞΟΔΟΝ Μάρκος ὁ μαθητὴς καὶ ἑρμηνευτὴς Πέτρου, καὶ αὐτὸς τὰ ὑπὸ Πετρου κηρυσσόμενα γεγραφὼς ἡμῖν παραδέδωκε. See also Smith on the Voyage of St. Paul, p. 218.

§ 1 Pet. v. 13.

it is observable, as in full accordance with this account of the authorship of these two Gospels respectively, that from St. Matthew's Gospel* alone we learn that the Evangelist belonged to the despised class of Publicans, while it is not *he*, but another Evangelist (St. Luke,)† who tells us the honourable fact that Levi *left all, rose up, and followed* Christ. And in like manner the *infirmities* of *St. Peter* are recorded with the most circumstantial fulness in the Gospel of *Marcus his son;* but we are left to gather our knowledge of his virtues and of the praises with which he was honoured by his Divine Master, from the other Gospels.

St. LUKE's Gospel, as all Christian antiquity witnesseth,‡ is due to the Apostle St. Paul, who was made "an able minister of the New Testament,"§ by "knowledge given him above measure, in visions and revelations of the Lord;"‖ and to St. Luke's fidelity St. Paul bears testimony, when he speaks of him as the *beloved physician*,¶ who *alone is with him*,** and probably, as the *brother whose praise is in the Gospel throughout all the Churches.*††

St. Paul was the Apostle, St. Luke the Evangelist, of the Gentiles.‡‡ The same spirit was in them both. Hence, in St. Luke's Gospel especially, there is a rich storehouse of comfort and hope for all who *sit in darkness and the shadow of death.* Here the good Samaritan, Christ Himself, pours oil and wine into the wounds of the broken-hearted. Here

* Matt. iv. 9, compared with Mark ii. 14. Luke v. 27; and Matth. x. 3, compared with Mark iii. 18. Luke vi. 15, whence Euseb. Dem. Ev. iii. c. 5, says well, Ματθαῖος ἑαυτοῦ στηλιτεύει βίον. The whole passage of Eusebius deserves a careful perusal.

† Luke v. 28.

‡ Iren. iii. 1. Tertullian. adv. Marcion. iv. 2; iv. 5. S. Hieron. Script. Eccl. c. 7.

§ 2 Cor. iii. 6. ‖ 2 Cor. xii. 7.

¶ Col. iv. 14. ** 2 Tim. iv. 11.

†† 2 Cor. viii. 18. Chrysos. Homil. in Act. i. Hieron. Vir. Illust. 7. Euseb. vi. 25. ‡‡ Origen ap. Euseb. vi. 25.

He calls them home in the parable of the Prodigal. Here He accepts them in the Publican. Here He visits them in Zacchæus. Here He pardons them in the penitent thief.

The fourth and last Gospel, which was written at or soon after the close of the first century, is also from an Apostle —St. John. Thus all the four Gospels are seen to be due to Christ's Apostles, who received special promises from Him that He would send them the Holy Ghost to teach them all things, to bring all things to their remembrance, and guide them into all truth,* and of whom it is said, that "when He had ascended up on high, He gave some Apostles, and some Evangelists, for the edifying of His Church."† Thus we behold the four Evangelic streams, when traced upward, issuing from the Apostolic wells which spring up from the One Divine Fountain of living waters, "who said, "Whosoever drinketh of the water that I shall give him, shall never thirst; but the water that I shall give him shall be in him a well of water springing up unto everlasting life."‡

The last Gospel, as we have said, was written by St. John. He was the disciple whom Jesus loved;§ he was the disciple who leaned on His breast at Supper, when He instituted the Feast of Love, in which the Church will show forth her Lord's death till He come;‖ he was the disciple to whom Jesus said on the Cross, *Behold thy Mother*, and who thenceforth *took her to his own home.*¶

The *other* Apostles were taken away, one after the other, by violent deaths,—by the cross, by the sword, by wild beasts, and by the stake. St. John survived them all. He was miraculously rescued from the furnace,** and at length

* John xiv. 26; xvi. 13. † Eph. iv. 11. ‡ John iv. 14.
§ John xiii. 23. ‖ 1 Cor. xi. 26. ¶ John xix. 27.
** From the cauldron of boiling oil, under Domitian. Tertullian. Præscr. Hær. 36. S. Polycarp. in Victor. Catenâ, ap. Feuard. Iren. iii. 3. Cotel. Patr. Ap. ii. 205.

died a natural death, at the age of above a hundred years.* The other Apostles were *sent to* Christ by *force;* St. John *tarried* till *Christ came* for him, and gently took him to Himself. Theirs was the martyrdom of death, his the martyrdom of life.

The beloved Disciple of the Incarnate Word was providentially preserved to a great old age, not only to refute the heretics who denied the Lord that bought them, and to convince us of the Divinity of the *Uncreated Word* who was in the beginning with God, but also to *complete* the witness of the *Written Word*, and to vindicate its Inspiration from the forgeries of false teachers, and to assure us of its fulness and divine character.

In confirmation of this assertion, let us now refer to a fact, attested by ancient and unexceptionable witnesses.† Towards the close of his long life, copies of the three Gospels of St. MATTHEW, St. MARK, and St. LUKE, which at that time, we are informed, had been diffused throughout Christendom, were publicly brought to St. JOHN, in the city of Ephesus, of which he was the Metropolitan, by some of the Bishops of the Asiatic Churches;‡ and in their presence St. John openly§ acknowledged these three Gospels

* Eusebii Chronicon. Hieron. Vir. Illust. IX. Comment in Matth. xx. 22; he died anno ætat. 120, according to Auct. Inc. cited in next note.

† Canon Muratorianus, Clem. Al. ap. Euseb. vi. 14. Euseb. iii. 24. Epiphan. Hær. li. S. Hieron. Script. Eccl. c. 9, in Matth. Procem. Victorin. in Apocalyps. Bibl. Patrum Max. iii. 418. Auct. Incert. apud Chrysost. Montfaucon. viii. 132, Appendix. Auct. Inc. ap. Augustin. in Joann. compulsus Joannes ab Asiæ Episcopis scripsit. . . Legerat Evangelia trium Evangelistarum et approbaverat fidem eorum et veritatem, and the next note but one.

‡ See the passages collected by Archbp. Ussher, Original of Bishops and Metropolitans. p. 63. Oxf. 1641.

§ Theodor. Mopsuest. (who flourished in the end of the fourth century,) says, (in Catenâ in Joann. Corderii, Mill. N. T. p. 198, ed.

as inspired, and, at their request, composed his own Gospel in order to *complete* the Evangelical Record of the Life and Teaching of Jesus Christ.

The second Evangelist St. Mark, authenticated the first, St. Matthew, by *adopting* much of his gospel; so, the third, St. Luke, guaranteed the first and second; the fourth, St. John, *omitted* much that the preceding three had related, and related what they had omitted; and so canonized them.*

Let it be remembered that the three earlier Gospels were at that time received by the Church as inspired; and if St. John had not been fully persuaded of their Inspiration,—he, who writes to others, *Beloved, believe not every Spirit, but try the Spirits whether they are of God*,†—would not have approved them as inspired, *as he did*, but he would have *rejected* them as falsely claiming to be divine.

Nor, again, acknowledging *them* as *divine*, would he have presumed to *add* his own Gospel as the consummation of theirs, unless he had been also sure that what *he himself* wrote was dictated by the same DIVINE SPIRIT who had inspired the other three.

It is also clear, that, by composing his own Gospel as the *complement* of the three preceding ones, he has given an infallible assurance to *us*, that *we*, who have the *four* Gospels,

1723.) ἐπήνεσεν (Ἰωάννης) τῆς ἀληθείας τοὺς γεγραφότας ἔφησε δὲ βραχέα παραλελεῖφθαι (τοῖς τρισὶν εὐαγγελισταῖς)· ἐπὶ τούτοις παράκλησις ἀδελφῶν (ἐν τῇ Ἀσίᾳ) ἐγένετο ταῦτα ἃ μάλιστα ἀναγκαῖα κρίνει πρὸς διδασκαλίαν, παραλελειμμένα δὲ ὁρᾷ τοῖς λοιποῖς (εὐαγγελισταῖς) γράψαι μετὰ σπουδῆς· ὃ καὶ πεποίηκεν.

* As a specimen of the manner in which St. John *takes* the *other gospels for granted*, the reader will remember John xx. 1. Mary Magdalene seeth "*the stone* taken away from the sepulchre." *What* stone? *St John* had not mentioned any stone. The answer is; the stone described by the *other* Evangelists (Matth. xxvii. 60; Mark xv. 46,) as placed by Joseph on the mouth of the tomb, and sealed by Pilate's order. (Matth. xxvii. 66.)

† 1 John iv. 1.

possess a *complete, divinely inspired*, History of our Lord's Ministry.

In the closing words of the twentieth chapter of his Gospel, St. John may be regarded as setting his Apostolic Seal on the whole Evangelic Volume which he holds, as it were, in his hands, and calls *this* BOOK; "Many other signs truly did Jesus in the presence of His Disciples, which are not written in this BOOK; but these are written that ye might believe that Jesus is the Christ; and that believing ye might have life through His Name."*

THIS BOOK: such is the name given by St. John to the Four Gospels. Thus we find that they are brought together into One. They all come to us through the hands of St. John. Thus, in a spiritual sense, is fulfilled our Lord's prophecy to him, "If I will that he tarry till I come, what is that to thee?"† St. John ever tarries with us in the Gospel, which, as our Lord declares, must "first be published to all nations, and then shall the end come."‡ Thus he tarries till Christ comes.

What better witness *could* we have or desire of the oneness, the fulness, the integrity, and the Inspiration of the Gospels, than the *Beloved Disciple*, who was specially qualified to understand divine things, by the unsullied purity of his life, even from his youth, who leaned on our Lord's breast at supper, and drank in heavenly truth from His Divine lips; and to whom Jesus Christ gave the most endearing pledge of His confidence and love, by commending to him His Mother from the Cross?

Who, again, a more faithful and competent authority in this solemn matter, than *that* Apostle, whose life appears to have been prolonged by Christ beyond that of all his Apostolic brethren, for this very purpose, that he might comfort Christ's widowed spouse, the Church; that he might take her also, if we may so speak, *to his own home;* and vin-

* John xx. 31. † Ibid. xxi. 22. ‡ Matth. xxiv. 14

dicate against false teachers the Divine honour of her Lord?

May we not, therefore, safely say, that by the hands of the beloved disciple, CHRIST Himself has set His seal on the Gospels; and that in receiving them through the hands of him who leaned on our Lord's breast at supper, we do in fact receive them from the mouth of CHRIST?

We proceed now to the remaining historical Book of the New Testament, the Gospel of the Holy Spirit,* (as it has been called, from its describing His Descent,) the ACTS of the APOSTLES.

We shall find that *its* Inspiration also is guaranteed to us by the same authority as that of the Holy Gospels.

The Acts of the Apostles, which the author, St. Luke, connects in his preface with his Gospel, of which it forms the sequel, was written, as well as his Gospel, in the company and under the direction of St. Paul;† and it may be regarded as a practical exhibition of the truth, taught by St. Luke's Gospel, that the glad tidings of salvation were to be preached to the Gentile World.

Some heretics of very early times were charged by contemporary Christian writers with *rejecting* the Acts of the Apostles; a charge which proves that this book was then *received* as Scripture by the *Church*.‡ Indeed, this fact is uncontrovertible; and, omitting other evidence of it, I pass on and refer to the important circumstance that the Book of the Acts of the Apostles was acknowledged as Scripture by ST. JOHN, somewhat in the same manner as the Gospels, and in the same city, Ephesus, of which he was the Chief Spiritual Pastor.

* S. Chrysost. in Acta Apost. i. 5.

† Iren. iii. 14, 15. Tertullian. adv. Marcion. iv. 2. Euseb. iii. 4. Hieron. Cat. Script. 7. See Biscoe on the Acts, i. 502—540.

‡ Tertullian. Præscr. Hær. 22. Adv. Marcion. v. 2.

It is recorded by Tertullian and St. Jerome, that when a certain presbyter of Ephesus had published a book in St. Paul's name, entitled the *Acts of Paul*, with the intention, as he alleged, of doing honour to the memory of that Apostle, St. John convicted the Author, and condemned the Book.*

Now we know that St. Luke's work, the Acts of the Apostles, was then received; and *if* it had *not* been what it professes to be, and what it was believed to be, an *inspired* record of the Acts of St. Paul, we may reasonably conclude that St. John would have condemned it also. His rejection of the one book of Acts was tantamount to a recognition of the other.

Let us bear in mind the peculiar situation in which St. John, the Apostolic Metropolitan of Ephesus, the capital of the Asia of the New Testament, in which city he died and was buried,† is thus seen to stand to the Gospels, which he there authorized in the presence of the Asiatic Bishops, and to the Acts of the Apostles, which he also sanctioned by proscribing the Apocryphal Acts of Paul, written by the Ephesian Presbyter. We shall thus see a new light thrown on the address in the Apocalypse to St. John's own Church of Ephesus, "Unto the angel of the Church of Ephesus write . . . I know thy works and thy labour, and thy patience, and how thou canst not bear them which are evil; and thou hast tried them, which say they are Apostles, and are not;"‡ a passage, which will appear more significant, when we remember the part which the Church of Ephesus took, in the person of St. John, in vindicating the genuine Scriptures from the supposititious, and in assuring the Universal Church of their Inspiration. Considering also that the Apocalyptic address is from the mouth of Christ Him-

* Tertullian. de Baptism. 17. Hieron. in Catal. Vir. Illust. in Lucâ 7.

† S. Hieron. de Vir. Illust. 9. Euseb. iii. 20. ‡ Rev. ii. 1, 2,

self, we may add, that it appears to contain a ratification from Him of St. John's act in canonizing the Gospels and the Acts. *He tried* those who were *Apostles*, and distinguished the true from the false.

Thus, my brethren, we see, that as by the hands of Moses, who was *faithful in all His house*,* God placed the first FIVE books of the OLD TESTAMENT in the Holy of Holies, by the side† of the Ark of the Covenant, and thus avouched them as divine, so Jesus, the *Mediator of the New Testament*, has committed the CHRISTIAN PENTATEUCH, as a sacred deposit, to the keeping of the Ark of His Church, by the hands of His beloved Apostle St. John.

Moses died, but the Holy of Holies remained: so St. John expired, but the Church of Christ lives. The Holy of Holies, to which the Pentateuch was consigned, was a standing witness of the divine character of the Books committed to its trust. So the Church, the Christian sanctuary, not confined, like the Levitical oracle, to one place, but diffused throughout the World, is a visible and audible Witness of the inspired Gospel. And therefore St. John appeals to her testimony. *This is the disciple*, he says, *which testifieth of these things;* and the Church echoes a response, *We know that his testimony is true.*‡ Such, we say, is the voice of the Church, which *received* and *read* these books *as inspired* writings, as soon as they were penned; and has guarded them entire to this day. Such is her voice to the World.

Her voice, be it remembered, is the voice of Christ; for *ye have an unction from the Holy One*,§ writes St. John, and ye *know all things;* and the Church is the *pillar and ground*‖ of the truth, the mystical body of Christ;¶ He loves her as Himself,** and has promised to be ever with

* Heb. iii. 5. † See above, p. 30. ‡ John xxi. 24.
§ 1 John ii. 20. ‖ 1 Tim. iii. 15. ¶ Eph. i. 23.
** Eph. v. 25, 29.

her.* Thus her witness is not her own: it is the witness of the Son of God.

It does not fall within the scope of our present design, to show how the belief produced by this *outward* testimony to the Inspiration of the Evangelical history is confirmed by the *internal* evidence supplied by the Gospels themselves.

The demonstration in which *we*, my brethren, are now engaged, is of a different kind, and possesses special advantages, commending itself by its comprehensive character, and not only declaring the truth of particular passages, and the inspiration of particular portions of the Sacred Volume, but bringing the whole together under the hand of CHRIST, in order to receive the superscription of His Divine signature, and the authentication of His Divine seal.

By this process we refute at once all the cavils of the Sceptic, arguing from supposed difficulties in particular passages of Scripture, and thence questioning its Inspiration.

In conclusion, let me offer two practical exhortations on this momentous subject. The Books of which we have been now speaking are not the words of man, but of God Himself. This is the assertion of the Church of England, which reads them daily as such. And the Realm of England professes the same faith in their Inspiration, when, on the most solemn public occasions, civil and judicial, she delivers them to her Citizens, in order to bind them by the sacred obligation of an Oath, and places them in the hands of her Sovereigns, when they are crowned and enthroned in the temple of God.

This belief, as we have shown, is authorized by Christ Himself.

But, my brethren, it must, alas! be owned that our practice, both public and private, is greatly at variance with this

* Matt. xxviii. 20.

profession. We acknowledge the Divine authority of the Gospel; but when we look at our present condition, domestic, social, and national, it must assuredly be confessed that we are very far indeed from living and acting under an abiding sense that the Gospel is the Word of God. Too many among us, like the Heretics of old, have composed other Gospels—Apocryphal Gospels—for ourselves; and have thus set aside the Gospel of Christ. Some have written for themselves a Gospel of Mammon; some a Gospel of Ambition; some a Gospel of godless Expediency; some a Gospel of Intellectual Pride; some a Gospel of Fashion, or of Honour, as it is most falsely called,—Gospels no less opposed to the Gospel of Christ than those heretical Gospels of the ancient Gnostics which were condemned by the Apostle St. John.

Do we suppose that these our forged Gospels can be otherwise than hateful to Christ? Do we remember, that *If any*,* even an Angel from Heaven, *preach to us any other Gospel than* what the Apostles preached, he is to be *anathema?* Do we remember what care our Divine Lord has taken to give and to preserve to us His own Gospel? Do we recollect that the Gospel of Christ is our only safe Guide of practice public and private,—that *it* and it *alone* is the code by which we shall be judged? He who has given us the Gospel; He who has inscribed His signature upon it; He who has stamped it with His seal; He has warned us of this—"The Word which I have spoken to you, the same shall judge you at the last day."†

Let me therefore earnestly exhort you, my younger hearers, to make the Gospel of Christ your only Rule of Life. Whatever it may cost you, fling away all false Gospels. Cast them into the flames, as the Ephesians‡ did their magical books. Remember, Christ has said: "Heaven and

* Gal. i. 8, 9. † John xii. 48. ‡ Acts xix. 19.

earth shall pass away, but My Words shall not pass away."*

One more caution, and I have done. We possess an inestimable privilege in our ready access to the Gospel. We are familiar with it from our infancy. We have it in our Churches, our Houses, our Lecture-Rooms, our Schools,—almost every where. But this great benefit may become a snare to us, if we are not on our guard. Unless we keep a watch over ourselves, our very familiarity with the Gospel may degenerate into irreverence, irreverence may sink into profaneness, and profaneness into unbelief. Holy things, if not treated holily, will recoil upon us for our unholiness. They will avenge their own cause, by becoming instruments of punishment. Let us therefore earnestly pray, that, in reading and hearing the Gospel, we may have grace to remember always that we are reading the Word and hearing the Voice of God. Then custom will only beget greater reverence. Familiarity with the Divine word will increase our awe for it.

The beloved Disciple, St. John, who was admitted into the nearest intimacy with the Incarnate Word, was chosen by Him to write concerning His Divinity; He who leaned on His breast at supper speaks most clearly of the Godhead of Christ. So let us dwell on the *written* Word. So, if I may thus speak, let us lean, as it were, upon it, and imbibe heavenly wisdom from it. With St. John, let us handle and adore. Then, with the same Apostle, the more we know, the more we shall love. Then we shall be like him who says, "That which was from the beginning, which we have heard, which we have seen with our eyes, which we have looked upon, and our hands have handled, of the Word of the Life," and who says also, "In the beginning was the Word, and the Word was with God, and the WORD WAS GOD."

* Matt. xxiv. 35.

LECTURE VII.

2 Pet. iii. 15, 16.

"*As our beloved brother Paul also, according to the wisdom given unto him hath written unto you; as also in all his Epistles, speaking in them of these things; in which are some things hard to be understood, which they that are unlearned and unstable wrest, as they do also the other Scriptures, unto their own destruction.*"

In the preceding Discourse, it was my purpose to show that the Inspiration of the Historical Books of the New Testament, that is of the Four Gospels and the Acts of the Apostles, is avouched to us by the Apostolic Churches, and by the Apostles themselves, and especially by *that* Apostle, who from his circumstances was eminently qualified to bear witness on this subject; I mean the beloved Disciple St. John. Our conclusion then was, that, if we bear in mind the relation of the Church, and of the Apostles, and of St. John, to Our Blessed Lord, we cannot hesitate to acknowledge, that *their* testimony on this solemn matter, is no other than the testimony of Christ.

We now proceed to consider the remaining Books of the New Testament; and on the present occasion it will be my endeavour to state the grounds on which the Epistles of the Apostle St. Paul are to be received as a part of Canonical Scripture, or of that Written Rule which has been

given us by Almighty God, for our direction in those things which we must believe and do, in order to our everlasting salvation.

Their claim to Inspiration, as we shall see, rests on the same foundation as that of the Historical Books, namely, on the authority of CHRIST; and we shall, I think, find on inquiry, that there exists a beautiful analogy between the *nature* of the *means* which Christ has been pleased to employ, in order to assure us of the Inspiration of the Evangelical History, and of that of the Apostolic Epistles.

Our present concern is only with those *Thirteen* Epistles which bear St. PAUL'S name at their commencement; that is, with *all* the Epistles commonly received as his, except that to the Hebrews, which does not so bear it, and is reserved for future consideration.

By way of introduction to our argument, let me first state briefly the evidence on which we affirm that these thirteen Epistles were written by St. Paul; and that *we* possess them at the present day, in precisely the same form and substance as that in which they first came from the hands of the Apostle.

It is remarkable, that St. Luke, the author of the Acts of the Apostles, and the companion of St. Paul on his journeys, does not inform us of the number and names of St. Paul's Epistles; indeed he says nothing of his having written any Epistles at all. The fact, which, perhaps, more than any other in the great Apostle's life has served to promote God's glory, and the good of His Church, was the writing of these Epistles, and the sending of them to seven different Churches. And, be it observed, these Epistles to those Churches *were all written* and *sent* in the time embraced by the history of the Acts of the Apostles. Yet this fact is not even alluded to in that Book.

Now, if the Acts had been written under mere human direction, this omission, I think, would have been morally

impossible. How then is it to be accounted for? It is due, I believe, to the circumstance that St. Luke was enabled to foresee that the number and names of St. Paul's Epistles, their authenticity and inspiration, of which it was essential that the Church should be assured, would be guaranteed by *other means:* and it deserves to be considered whether this very *silence* of St. Luke concerning so important a matter in the life of St. Paul, does not come in as a confirmation, the more powerful because unobtrusive, of the great truth, that the Apostolic Historian was guided by supernatural direction, not only in what he has *said*, but (which is an effect of Inspiration, not so often observed, but not less important,) in what he has left *unsaid.*

I. But to proceed. How then do we show that the Epistles ascribed to St. Paul were written by him? And that they have been preserved safe and entire to this day?

1. They all bear his name. *Paul, an Apostle of Jesus Christ:* this, or something like it, is the style in which they commence. Again, in the beginning of some of them, the writer associates *other* persons with himself. *Paul, and Sylvanus, and Timotheus, to the Church of the Thessalonians.** Thus, he cites two witnesses to their genuineness. Again, at their *close*, he delivers particular messages from various individuals to other parties. These persons, also, are thus brought in as witnesses.

2. He did not write his Epistles with *his own hand. One* exception there was to this practice, the *Epistle* to the *Galatians;*† in which he expressly *mentions* the fact of his writing *that* Epistle with his own hand, in order to obviate any doubt as to the genuineness of the others *not* so written. But his usual habit was to employ an amanuensis. *I, Ter-*

* 1 Thess. i. 1. 2 Thess. i. 1. † Gal. vi. 11.

*tius, who wrote this Epistle, salute you in the Lord.** This amanuensis also was a witness.

3. Though, (as was usual for authors in those days,) St. Paul *dictated* his Epistles to a secretary, yet he invariably *subscribed* them with his own hand. "The salutation of Paul with mine own hand, which is the token in every Epistle; so I write.† The salutation by the hand of me Paul; remember my bonds. The salutation of me Paul with mine own hand. If any man love not the Lord Jesus Christ, let him be anathema."

4. We must bear in mind that he sent his Epistles by private, special, messengers. Thus Timothy and Titus were the bearers of the two Epistles to the Corinthians. Phœbe, it seems, conveyed that to the Romans; Tychicus, that to the Colossians and Ephesians;‡ Epaphroditus, that to the Philippians. These messengers, whoever they were, bore testimony to the hand from which the Epistles came.

5. Further still, which is most important to be observed, Nine of these Thirteen Epistles are addressed, not to *private* individuals, but to *public communities*, to Christian *Churches*, and indeed to the Church at large.

Their language is, "Paul and all the brethren which are with me unto the Churches of Galatia.§ Paul unto the Church of God, which is at Corinth, with all the Saints that are in all Achaia, with all that in every place call upon the name of Jesus Christ our Lord."‖

6. Nor is this all. The Author commands these Churches to *read* his Epistles in their public religious assemblies. At the close of the first Epistle which he wrote,—the first to the Thessalonians,—St. Paul thus speaks; "I adjure¶ you

* Rom. xvi. 22.

† 2 Thess. iii. 17. Col. iv. 18. 1 Cor. xvi. 21.

‡ See Bp. Pearson in Jacobson's Patres Apostolici, Ignat. ad Ephes. c. 12.

§ Gal. i. 1, 2. ‖ 2 Cor. i. 1. 1 Cor. i. 1, 2.

¶ ὁρκίζω. 1 Thess. v. 27.

by the Lord, that this Epistle be read unto all the holy brethren."

7. We may reasonably conclude that this order was *obeyed*, from the *Second* Epistle to the *same* Church, in which he* *praises* the Thessalonians for their faith; which he would not have done, had they disobeyed his command to *read* his *former* Epistle. And he takes for granted, that the Second Epistle will be made known to all persons in the same manner. "Brethren, stand fast and hold the traditions which ye have been taught whether by word, or our Epistle;" . . . and, "If any man obey not our word by this Epistle, note that man, and have no company with him."†

Besides, it is clear that this order thus given in the first Epistle which he wrote, and reinforced in the second to the same Church, was obeyed, as a matter of course, by *all the Churches* to which his Epistles were sent. This may be inferred from the fact, that to the Corinthians he says, "We write none other things unto you than what ye read or‡ acknowledge;"§ and, in one of the last Epistles which he wrote, that to the Colossians, he assumes that this Epistle *will* be read by that Church; and he gives direction for its communication to another Church. "Salute the brethren which are in Laodicea, and when this Epistle is read among you, cause that it be read also in the Church of the Laodiceans."‖

8. Finally, it is evident, that St. Paul's Epistles were so received, and were read as divinely inspired *Scripture*, together with the Old Testament and the Gospels of the New, from the testimony of Ignatius¶ and Polycarp,** the disci-

* 2 Thess. i. 3, 4 † 2 Thess. ii. 15; iii. 6; iii. 14.

‡ *And* (καὶ) is in some MSS.; not *or*. § 2 Cor. i. 13.

‖ Col. iv. 15, 16. The Epistle from Laodicea was probably the Epistle to the Ephesians, communicated to Colossæ through Laodicea. See Bp. Pearson on Ignat. ad Ephes. c. 12.

¶ Ignat. ad Ephes. c. 12.

** Polycarp. ad Phil. c. 3. 11, 12. The Epistle to the Ephesians is here classed with the Psalms, as *Scripture*.

ples of St. John, and from Clement,* the fellow-labourer of St. Paul; and, as we shall show, from his brother Apostle, St. Peter.

Thus, in the peculiar circumstances of the composition, of the transcription, and of the transmission of these Epistles, we possess a large amount of *contemporary* testimony that they are the writings of St. Paul; and in the reception of them as his, and in the public reading of them in religious assemblies for Divine worship, by the Christian Churches, to which they were sent as soon as they were written, we have a solemn attestation from large contemporary *communities* of men to the same effect.

Since, also, from the day of their promulgation to the present hour, there never has been a time in which these Epistles, so written, and so received, and so read, have *ceased to be read* in the public assemblies of Christendom, either in their original Language or in the Translations which have been made of them into almost every tongue under heaven, therefore it may be confidently affirmed, that there are no ancient writings in existence, whose *Genuineness* and *Integrity* are established on stronger evidence than the EPISTLES of ST. PAUL.

II. We must now inquire—what is the proof of their *Inspiration?*

First, we reply, the Author *claims to be inspired.*

In the first Epistle from his pen St. Paul thus writes: "When ye received the word of God which ye heard of us, ye received it not as the word of men, but, as it is in truth, the word of God.† He that despiseth, despiseth not man, but God, who hath also given unto us His Holy Spirit.‡ We

* Clement ad Cor. i. c. 47. The Epistle to the Corinthians is here called εὐαγγέλιον; and it is said that verily Paul wrote it in the Spirit, ἐπ' ἀληθείας πνευματικῶς.

† 1 Thess. ii. 13. ‡ 1 Thess. iv. 8.

speak not in the words which man's wisdom teacheth, but which the Holy Ghost teacheth."* He declares to the Galatians, that he is "an Apostle not of men, neither by man, but by Jesus Christ;"† and that he received what he preached "not from man, neither was he taught it, but by the revelation of Jesus Christ." He praises them for receiving him "as an angel of God, even as Christ Jesus."‡ To the Thessalonians he says: "Our Gospel came not unto you in word only, but . . . in the Holy Ghost.§ He recounts to the Corinthians his "Visions and Revelations of the Lord."‖ He distinguishes between what he says as a *man* speaking from himself, and what he declares as an inspired Apostle. In the one case, he says, "that which I speak, I speak it *not after the Lord;*" in the other, *not I, but the Lord.* And again: *I think*¶ *that I have the Spirit of God.***

Hence it is clear, that the writer of these Epistles lays *claim* to Inspiration.

But—Yes, it may be replied, and so have many persons who have been deluded by vain imaginations. Every enthusiast who has deceived himself or others has boasted of supernatural revelations. But what is the *proof*, that, in the case of the Writer of these Epistles, the assertion is *true?*

Let us examine this question.

First, then, let us look at the *person* who wrote them. He was the object of bitter antipathy to the Jews, who stigmatized him as an apostate; and for some time after his conversion he was regarded with jealous suspicions by the Christians, whom he had persecuted with furious zeal. No one had more powerful prejudices to encounter on all sides

* 1 Cor. ii. 13. † Gal. i. 1. 12. ‡ Gal. iv. 14.
§ 1 Thess. i. 5. ‖ 2 Cor. xii. 1. ¶ δοκῶ. I deem, or judge.
** 1 Cor. vii. 6. 10. 12. 40.

than St. Paul. No one's claims, even to honesty and sincerity, much more to supernatural gifts, were sure, on all accounts, in all places, to be more strictly scrutinized than his.

Consider, next, the *places* to which he addressed his Epistles. Cast your eyes upon the habitable globe, as it existed in the age of St. Paul. He did *not* choose his own native Tarsus; he did *not* select obscure villages and illiterate municipalities. No; he indited his Epistles to the most illustrious Cities of the world. Sea-ports crowded with ships, Marts thronged with merchants, Schools echoing with Eloquence, Citadels crowned with Temples,—Streets and Squares adorned with Museums, Baths, and Theatres, all that could minister to the physical enjoyment and intellectual pride of man,—these were the characteristics of those Cities which St. Paul *chose* to address. He encountered heathenism there. There he planted the Cross.

Behold the first City which he addressed—THESSALONICA. Seated on a noble bay, plying a rich trade with the East and West by sea, and placed on the great High-road from Italy to Asia, and from the North of Greece to the South, it collected within its walls a vast and active population of heathens and of Jews,—Paul's inveterate foes.

Here was his first Auditory. To them he writes with the authority of a man speaking from Heaven. What confidence in himself and in his cause does this selection prove!

Whom did he next address? CORINTH. The Seat of the Proconsular Government of Achaia; the centre of the commerce and literature, and of the luxury and vice, of Greece. Here he had many enemies, even among professing Christians. Some were of *Cephas;* others, of *Apollos;** many had been beguiled by the heretical wiles of a false Teacher, who denied St. Paul's authority, and earned a wretched popularity by preaching a hollow religion, with no solid

* 1 Cor. i. 12.

morality or fixed articles of faith. Many, also, there were at Corinth, whose fastidious ears had been charmed by the soft and melodious accents of practised rhetoricians; and whose tastes were too effeminate to relish the stern and healthy eloquence of the bold free-spoken Apostle.

Yet St. Paul was not daunted. The Divine Spirit moved in his heart. He felt it there. He would not, therefore, stoop to gain favour by flattery. He calls the wise Corinthians *babes;* he tells them that they have *need of milk*, and *cannot bear strong meat.** He rebukes some of them sharply for disbelieving the Resurrection of the body.† He orders them to excommunicate the incestuous member of their Church.‡ He reproves the most eminent among them, for an ostentatious display of spiritual gifts."§ He censures others for irreverence at public worship, and at the celebration of the Lord's Supper.|| He shows, in a word, that God has "not given him the spirit of fear, but of power, and of a sound mind."¶

He next writes to GALATIA, the stronghold of Judaism. He will not bribe them by praise. Rather, "O foolish Galatians!" he exclaims, "who hath bewitched you, that ye should not obey the truth? How turn ye again to the weak and beggarly elements, whereunto ye desire again to be in bondage?"**

From Corinth he sends a letter to the great Capital of the World—ROME. He had not yet visited it; yet he assumes that his name is well known to the Church there. He speaks to it *with all authority*. He promises to *impart to it spiritual gifts*. "I am debtor both to the Greeks and to the Barbarians, both to the Wise and to the Unwise: so, as much as in me is, I am ready to preach the Gospel to you that are at Rome also."††

* Cor. iii. 1, 2. † Ibid. xv. 12. ‡ Ibid. v. 13.
§ Ibid. xiv. 12. || Ibid. xi. 17. ¶ 2 Tim. i. 7.
** Gal. iii. 1; iv. 9. †† Rom. i. 11, 14, 15.

What a powerful conviction does he thus show of the truth of his own mission! He, a Jew of Tarsus, ventures to write in such terms as these to the imperial City, whose armies were marching on every land, and whose fleets were floating on every sea, and who dictated laws to the world. To Rome he went, having appealed to Cæsar; and from his lowly dwelling there, Paul, *the prisoner of the Lord*,* wrote to PHILIPPI, a Roman Colony in Macedonia. He addressed that Church in terms of approval, such as he had not extended to more splendid cities. He wrote also to COLOSSAE, a magnificent town of Phrygia, and *condemned the vain Philosophy*† of some who were eminent there. He wrote, also, to EPHESUS, the flourishing emporium of Ionia,‡ the resort of the votaries of the "great goddess Diana, whom Asia and the world worshipped;" he describes the crowds who adored her as "having no hope, and without God in the world,"§ and affirms that, in order to be saved, they must embrace the Gospel which he preached;‖ and that they who "were sometimes darkness would then be light in the Lord."¶

Such, my beloved brethren, were the Cities which St. Paul *chose* to address in the Epistles written by him at intervals during a period of about ten years; beginning in the fifteenth year after his conversion, and ending in the fifth before his martyrdom.**

We pause here to observe, as a most remarkable fact, that, as we have now seen, the Apostle St. Paul, who was the special object of prejudice in various quarters, who was pursued with unrelenting hatred by the Jews, and who had many difficulties to encounter, even among Christians; who

* Eph. iii. 1; iv. 1. Philem. 9.
† Col. ii. 8.
‡ Acts xix. 27, 35, 37.
§ Eph. ii. 2—12; iv. 17—19.
‖ Ibid. ii. 5—8.
¶ Ibid. v. 8.
** Bp. Pearson, Annales Paulini, ii. 12—20.

was forsaken by Demas* and by others; who had no one like-minded;† who on one occasion was left alone‡ with St. Luke, and on another of great trial had no one to stand by him;§ whose claims, therefore, to Inspiration had *no human* power to back them, *did* address letters to the Christians in the greatest cities of the world, in which he had numerous adversaries; and that in these letters he often speaks in terms of severe *censure* of those whom he addressed, and that in these letters he lays claim to *Inspiration*, and commands them to read them publicly in their *religious* assemblies, as *sacred* Books, precisely in the same manner as the Books of Moses and the Prophets *were* read in the Synagogues; and that this *command was obeyed, without exception.*

This is a most striking fact.

The question now arises, How came it to pass that this order *was* executed?

There can be but one reply. They, to whom the letters were sent, *were convinced* of their INSPIRATION. Otherwise they would have *rejected* them.

And by what means were they so convinced?

There was but one way—by Visible Proofs. They could never have been persuaded, except by *miracles* wrought by the Writer in their presence, or in that of credible witnesses.

True, indeed, if St. Paul had wrought miracles, and *if* his *doctrine* had *not* been in accordance with God's Law, natural and revealed, then, we allow, miracles would not have sufficed to establish his claim to Inspiration.|| But, since the teaching of St. Paul *is* in perfect accordance with Divine Truth as impressed on the face of Creation, and as declared by Moses and by Christ, then Miracles wrought by him were attestations from Heaven that what he asserted was true,

* 2 Tim. iv. 10. † Phil. ii. 20. ‡ 2 Tim. iv. 11.
§ 2 Ibid. iv. 10, 11, 16. || Deut. xiii. 1—5.

and that therefore the claim which he makes to be inspired is authorized by ALMIGHTY GOD.

Did, then, Paul really give these proofs of Inspiration?

His companion, St. Luke, replies to this question: "GOD wrought special miracles at Ephesus by the hands of Paul, so that from his body were brought unto the sick, handkerchiefs or aprons, and the diseases departed from them, and the evil spirits went out of them."* Again: "Long time abode he in Iconium, speaking boldly in the LORD, who gave testimony to the word of His grace, and granted signs and wonders to be done by his hands."† These, be it observed, are assertions that miracles were wrought by St. Paul in *populous cities;* and the Acts of the Apostles, the Book in which these assertions are made, was publicly read as the Word of God in the Churches of *those very cities* where it affirms the miracles to have been wrought.

These Cities therefore by this public reading proclaimed the truth of those Miracles: they are Witnesses of it: and whole communities could not be deceived in this matter; therefore, these Miracles were wrought, and St. Paul's Inspiration is proved.

Turn also to the Epistles themselves. In them St. Paul frequently appeals to miracles, which he asserts that he wrought in *the presence* of those very persons and societies to whom he addresses his Epistles, and by whom they were to be openly *read.* "Truly," says he to the Corinthians,‡ "the signs of an Apostle were wrought among you in all patience, in signs, and wonders, and mighty deeds." He refers the Romans to the witness of all Europe. "I will not dare to speak of those things which Christ hath not wrought by me, to make the Gentiles obedient by word and deed, through mighty signs and wonders, by the power of

* Acts xix. 11, 12. † Ibid. xiv. 3.

‡ 2 Cor. xii. 12. See 1 Cor. ii. 4, 6; ix. 2. 2 Cor. iv. 2; vi. 4. Eph. iii. 7. Gal. ii. 8; iii. 5. 1 Thess. i. 5. Compare Hebr. ii. 4.

the Spirit of God, so that from Jerusalem, and round about unto Illyricum, I have fully preached the Gospel of Christ."*

Now, be it remembered, these asseverations are made in Epistles addressed by St. Paul to large *communities*, in cities where he had many *adversaries*. These affirmations too concern things which are averred by him to have been done in *their presence*, or in that of other trustworthy persons. And on the strength of these acts, the Author of these writings claims to be acknowledged as inspired, and commands that his Epistles, (in which this claim to Inspiration is made,) should be read as the Word of God. And these Epistles, containing this claim, *are read* by these communities. This reading of them is a public, practical, contemporary proof that these miraculous acts *were really* wrought, and that, *therefore*, St. Paul's *claim to Inspiration is avouched by Almighty God.*

Thus, we see, my brethren, that the greatest Cities of the World then in existence, bear testimony to St. Paul's divine mission. From Thessalonica to Corinth, from the shores of the Euxine to those of the Adriatic, from the banks of the Ilissus to those of the Tiber, his claims, as soon as made, were hailed and allowed by a responsive voice of harmonious assent, which has never died away, from that hour to this, but has gone on extending itself on every side to the furthest regions of the globe.

Again, these communities had a peculiar character. They were *Churches*, and, as such, they possessed special graces and special authority. The early Churches had the power of *discerning spirits*,† as we know from St. Paul; they are commanded to *try the spirits*‡ by St. John; therefore they had *supernatural* helps for pronouncing a true judgment on

* Rom. xv. 18, 19.

† 1 Cor. xii. 10. For proofs of *miraculous charismata* existing in the early Church, see S. Iren. ii. 57.

‡ 1 John iv. 1.

inspired writings. And when, as is the case with respect to the inspiration of St. Paul's Epistles, the suffrages of all the Churches, which compose the Universal Church, agree with one voice, and have agreed for eighteen centuries, their witness cannot be false. If it were, then Christ's promise, to be always with His Church,* and to send His Spirit to teach her all things, and to guide her into all truth,† would have failed of its effect. No. We do not hesitate to affirm, that the testimony of *all Christendom for eighteen hundred years* is no other than the verdict of CHRIST.

So far, then, we perceive that the Inspiration of ST. PAUL'S Epistles rests on the same ground as that of the Gospels and the Acts of the Apostles.

But we may trace the analogy further.

The Inspiration of the FOUR GOSPELS and the ACTS of the APOSTLES is, as was shown in the last discourse, specially authenticated by CHRIST through the beloved disciple ST. JOHN. That of the Epistles of St. Paul, as we shall now briefly show, is attested by CHRIST through ST. PETER.

In the passage which I have chosen for the text, St. Peter calls *all* Paul's Epistles by the name *Scripture*. *St. Peter*, I say, so calls them; for, whatever may be alleged concerning the *canonical*‡ authority of the Epistle from which the text is taken, it was doubtless written by St. Peter.§

* Matt. xxviii. 20. † John xiv. 26.

‡ See this question considered below, Lect. XI.

§ The writer of this Epistle calls himself an Apostle, and identifies himself with St. Peter. *Simon Peter, a servant and an Apostle of Jesus Christ.* (2 Pet. i. 1.) These are its first words. Its Author, also, refers to a former Epistle written by himself to the same parties (2 Pet. iii. 1;) and we possess such an Epistle written by St. Peter.

Again, the writer describes himself as having been a witness of the Transfiguration of Christ on the *Holy Mount* (2 Pet. i. 18,) at which

Let us next observe, that he wrote it in anticipation of his own immediate death. "I think it meet,"* says he, "as long as I am in this tabernacle to stir you up by putting you in remembrance, knowing that shortly I must put off this my tabernacle, even as our Lord Jesus Christ showed† me. Moreover, I will endeavour that ye may be able after my decease to have these things always in remembrance."

Now St. Peter suffered martyrdom by crucifixion, according to our Lord's prophecy,‡ recorded in the last chapter of St. John's Gospel; and this event took place at Rome, in the year of our Lord 68, the same year as that in which St. Paul was beheaded as a Martyr in the same city.§

Therefore, when St. Peter wrote his Second Epistle, *all* St. Paul's Epistles had been written. They had been *collected* together, and formed, as it were, a Volume, publicly known as St. Paul's; and *all* these *Epistles*, so collected, are called "SCRIPTURE" by St. Peter.

Now, the word here translated SCRIPTURE,|| which properly means simply a *Writing*, occurs fifty-one times in the New Testament; and in *all* these fifty-one places it is applied to *the* writings of the OLD or NEW TESTAMENT, and to *no other*.¶ Therefore, Peter by calling *all* St. Paul's Epistles "SCRIPTURE," places them on a level with the Books of Moses and the Prophets, that is, with those Books which had been received and quoted as the Word of God by CHRIST Himself.

none of the Apostles were present but James, and John, and Peter. The writer, then, of this Epistle was the Apostle St. Peter.

* 2 Pet. i. 13.

† ἐδήλωσε. 2 Pet. i. 14, 15. Compare John xxi. 18.

‡ John xxi. 18.

§ See Bp. Pearson, Annales Paulini, p. 25. || Γραφή.

¶ See above, p. 50, where it is observed that this exclusive reservation of the word γραφή shows the design of the Holy Spirit to put the *New* Testament on a par with the *Old*, and to *distinguish* them both from all *other* writings whatsoever.

Thus, St. Paul's Epistles are canonized by Christ, through St. Peter.

Let us also observe the evidence which shows that no better witness could have been employed for this purpose, than St. Peter.

First, his impartiality in this matter is unquestionable. Some persons had endeavoured to set him up as a rival to St. Paul. *I am of Cephas*,* were the words of a powerful party. Many looked upon Peter, and John, and James, as the three main *pillars* of the Church.† St. Peter's sympathies were with the Jews to whom he had a special mission, and among them were St. Paul's bitterest foes; and on one occasion, St. Peter, through mistaken partiality for them, was betrayed into a weak concession at Antioch; through fear of alienating them, he abstaining from eating with the Gentiles.‡

Bearing all these things in mind, let us remember that St. Paul, in one of his Epistles, calls himself "not a whit behind the very chiefest Apostles;"§ that in another, he says, that he "laboured more abundantly than they all;"‖ that in another, he declares that "he has the care of all the Churches,"¶ and says, "so ordain I in all the Churches;"** and in another, that to the Galatians, he recounts the circumstances of St. Peter's infirmity and compromise at Antioch, to which I have just referred, and says that he withstood Peter to the face, because he was to be blamed.

In admiring, therefore, St. Peter's frank generosity and beautiful disinterestedness in referring to the Epistles of his beloved brother Paul, in which all these things are contained, we must also affirm that those Epistles could not have had a more impartial, and therefore a better, witness than St. Peter.

* 1 Cor. i. 12.
† Gal. ii. 9.
‡ Ibid. ii. 11—16.
§ 2 Cor. xi. 5; xii. 11.
‖ 1 Cor. xv. 10.
¶ 2 Cor. xi. 28.
** 1 Cor. vii. 17.

One word here on another important subject. How could St. Paul have ventured to use such expressions, as those I have just cited, concerning *himself* in his Epistles, *if St. Peter* had been Infallible, and had been Supreme Visible Head of the Church? and if such had been the case, How could St. Peter himself have received *these Epistles as Scripture?*

Let our Romanist brethren consider these two questions. . . . But I pass on.

When the Apostle Peter wrote his Second Epistle, from which our text is taken, he was old, and knew that the time was at hand when he must obey Christ's words to him, *Follow thou Me.** He was now preparing to follow Christ, to stretch forth his hands and to be girded to the Cross.

What a solemn tone of seriousness, therefore, is there in this his testimony, his farewell testimony, concerning the Epistles of St. Paul! Surely the Holy Spirit was then with him. Surely his dear Lord and Master was with the aged Apostle when he thus wrote: and in the words of the dying Martyr, acknowledging and commending St. Paul's Epistles *as Scripture*, we have, we may venture to say, the declaration of CHRIST.

It deserves carefully to be remarked, that the great Apostle St. Paul, of whose Epistles we have been now speaking, and who was St. Peter's companion in dying for Christ, when, like him, he takes leave of the Church, aims also, like Peter, to rivet her attention, and fix her whole mind, upon SCRIPTURE.

In his Second Epistle to Timothy,—the last which he wrote,—St. Paul says, "I am now ready to be offered, and the time of my departure is at hand; I have fought a good fight, I have kept the faith; henceforth is laid up for me a

* John xxi. 22. Cp. 2 Pet. i. 14.

crown of righteousness."* And that no one might doubt *how* this crown is to be won, he says to his beloved son in the faith, "Continue thou in the things which thou hast learned, and hast been assured of, knowing of whom thou hast learned them, and that from a child thou hast known the HOLY SCRIPTURES, which are able† to make thee wise unto salvation, through faith which is in Christ Jesus." ALL SCRIPTURE, he adds, (that is, all writing called SCRIPTURE, and therefore St. Paul's own Epistles, called SCRIPTURE by St. Peter,)—"All Scripture is given by Inspiration of God, and is profitable for doctrine, for reproof, for correction, for instruction, that the man of God may be perfect, thoroughly furnished unto all good works."‡ Such were among the last words of St. Paul.

To sum up what has been now said. In the last discourse it was shown, that it was reserved for the old age of ST. JOHN to bear testimony to the Inspiration of the GOSPELS, and of the ACTS of the APOSTLES. I have now endeavoured to show that it was reserved for the old age of ST. PETER to attest that the EPISTLES of ST. PAUL are the Word of God.

Among the twelve chosen Apostles, St. John was specially *beloved of* Christ, and St. Peter was eminent for *his love to Christ,—Lord, Thou knowest all things, Thou knowest that I love Thee.*§ St. John and St. Peter were joined together by love to their Lord and to one another. They were attendant on Him in His private retirements; on the mountain of Transfiguration, and in the garden of Gethsemane. Together they prepared the room for the Institution of the Lord's Supper; together they visited the tomb of the

* 2 Tim. iv. 6—8.

† TA' δυνάμενα, properly, "THE things which are able," as contrasted with *all other* writings. This ought to be carefully observed.

‡ 2 Tim. iii. 14—17. § John xxi. 15.

risen Saviour; together they went up to the Temple to pray; together they healed the cripple at the Beautiful gate of the Temple; together they were sent by the Apostles to Samaria, to administer the rite of Confirmation; and now, *having been lovely and pleasant in their lives*, in their death *they are not* divided.* Peter and John, the loving and loved Apostles, are chosen by CHRIST Himself to be witnesses for ever to His Church of the Inspiration of His Written Word.

Let me now offer two practical observations, and I have done.

From what has been said now and in the last discourse, we see clearly that no one who loves the truth, and is duly sensible of what Christ has done for us, to assure us of the Inspiration of Scripture, can venture to assert,—as has, alas! been asserted by some in our own day,—that the Canon of the New Testament was not *settled till the fourth century*, and that, if we will believe the New Testament to be inspired, we must receive all the doctrines which are taught by the Church of Rome!

The fact is, my brethren, as we have seen, the Canon of the Gospels and of the Acts of the Apostles and of St. Paul's Epistles was settled *as soon as they were written;* and it was fixed, through the agency of the *Apostles*, by CHRIST Himself.

Therefore all the arguments drawn from the alleged lateness of the Canon, in order to impugn the sufficiency of Scripture as the Rule of Faith, fall to the ground.

Lastly, by means of the three Apostles, St. John, St. Peter, and St. Paul, we, who live now, have received from Christ Himself a divine witness to the Sufficiency of Holy Scripture as our Rule of Faith. Christ, dying on the cross, gave a special token of love to St. John, *Behold thy Mother.*

* 2 Sam. i 23.

And St. John, closing the Evangelical Canon, says, "These things are written that ye might believe that Jesus is the Christ, and that believing ye might have life in His Name."* Christ, risen from the dead, gave a special charge to St. Peter, "Simon, son of Jonas, lovest thou Me? Feed My Sheep." Christ, having ascended into heaven, gave a special commission to St. Paul. "I have appeared unto thee to make thee a Minister and a Witness both of these things which thou hast seen, and of those things in the which I will appear unto thee, delivering thee from the people and from the Gentiles, unto whom now I send thee, to open their eyes, and to turn them from darkness to light, and from the power of Satan unto God, that they may receive forgiveness of sins, and inheritance among them which are sanctified by faith which is in Me."†

Therefore in the farewell words of these three Apostles to the Church, we hear Christ. In those of St. John, we hear Jesus Christ, speaking to us from the Cross; in those of St. Peter, Jesus Christ risen from the dead; and in those of St. Paul, Jesus Christ ascended into Heaven.

These three great Apostles, thus beloved, charged, and sent by Christ, spent many years in faithfully preaching the Gospel; and when they were about to quit the world, and to go to Christ, they all left one and the same parting admonition to the Church.

And what was that?

St. John, at the close of his Gospel, St. Peter and St. Paul, in the last Epistles which they wrote, when they were ready to be offered up, and the time of their departure was at hand, all agree in referring the Church to SCRIPTURE.

This, they tell her, is the sacred deposit, in which the truth is stored; this, when they were about to leave the world, they bequeathed to her as a perfect Rule of Faith,

* John xx. 31. † Acts xxvi. 16—18.

and an unerring Guide to Heaven. Thanks be to Christ! this Rule, this Guide we have. Let us therefore use it aright. "He that hath ears to hear let him hear. These things are written that ye might believe that Jesus is the Christ, and that believing ye might have life in His Name."

LECTURE VIII.

2 Pet. iii. 15, 16.

"*Even as our beloved brother Paul, according to the wisdom given unto him, hath written unto you; as also in all his Epistles, speaking in them of these things; in which are some things hard to be understood, which they that are unlearned and unstable wrest, as they do also the other Scriptures, unto their own destruction.*"

In the last Discourse, upon these words of St. Peter, it was my endeavour to state the grounds upon which the Thirteen Epistles, which exhibit the name of St. Paul at their commencement, are to be received as the Word of God; and the Epistle to the Hebrews, which does not bear his name in any part of it, was then reserved for future consideration.

I would now request your attention to *that* Epistle; and I propose to examine, in this and the following discourse, the question of its Authorship, and how its claims to Inspiration are established.

This is a very important subject. The contents of this Epistle are of a most solemn character. The Eternal Existence and Divine Nature of our Blessed Lord; His operations in creating and governing all things; His Humanity; His Priestly Office; the Plenitude of the Atonement made by Him upon the Cross; His heavenly Intercession for us; the true nature of the Mosaic Law; its harmony with the

Gospel, to which it was subservient and introductory, and in which it was fulfilled and abrogated; the yearning of the Patriarchs for Christ; the finality of the Gospel which He preached; the sin of despising it; the heinousness of falling from the faith and of wavering in it; the certainty of Judgment, of Heaven and of Hell; these are the sublime topics of this glorious Epistle.

Again; the occasion on which it was written gives greater solemnity to it. It was addressed primarily to Hebrew Christians at Jerusalem* and in the East; and secondarily, to all converted and unconverted Jews; and finally, to all Christians and to all men of all ages in the world.

It appears, that some to whom it was first directed had been induced by Jewish teachers, or by fear of persecution, or by the frustration of a mistaken hope of soon seeing Christ's second Coming, to forsake public worship, as if Christ would never come at all; others had sunk into apathy; others had given themselves up to worldly cares and sinful lusts; others had denied their baptism, had apostatized from Christianity and fallen back into Judaism. Their circumstances, therefore, were such as to call for a clear announcement of the terrors of the Gospel. They were to learn from the fearful judgments which fell upon the Israelites in the Wilderness for despising *Moses*, that, much more, no one can escape who rejects CHRIST; and that though He is infinite in mercy to those who fear Him, yet, to all who receive not His Word, and obey not His precepts, "Our God is a consuming fire."†

Let it also be observed, that, from the peculiar nature of its contents, we may justly regard the Epistle to the Hebrews as one of the most efficient means under God for bringing

* See S. Chrysostom's Introduction to this Epistle, iv. p. 428. ed. Savil.

† Heb. xii. 29.

about the great work which *still remains* to be performed by the Church of Christ,—the *Conversion of the Jews.*

We are now led to inquire,—Is this Epistle Inspired?

To this question we reply, first, that the Church of which we are members, following the judgment of the Church Universal, ascribes it to the Apostle St. Paul,* and although, if it be proved *not* to be his, its claims to Inspiration would not therefore be annulled: yet, if it *be* the work of that Apostle, then the arguments employed in our last Discourse, with respect to the Thirteen Epistles which bear his name, must be applied to *this* Epistle also; and St. Peter, in acknowledging *all* St. Paul's Epistles to be SCRIPTURE, as he does in the words of the Text, will have avouched its Inspiration by his Apostolic authority.

Is, then, this Epistle ST. PAUL'S?

Some persons, as you are aware, and I believe we must say a majority of Biblical Critics in Germany at this day, answer the question in the *negative.*†

1. St. Paul, they observe, was the Apostle of the *Gentiles.* He calls himself by that title. Could he, then, write to the *Hebrews?* Since, also, *St. Peter* was the Apostle of the Circumcision, as St. Paul himself acknowledges,‡ would not St. Paul, by writing to the Hebrews, have invaded St. Peter's office? And does not St. Paul, as well as St. Peter, *condemn* those who are *busy-bodies* and intrude where they

* The Church of England, in her Authorized Version, entitles it "The Epistle of *Paul* the Apostle to the *Hebrews;*" and in her Book of Common Prayer, in the "Order for the Visitation of the Sick," she says, "*St. Paul* saith in the twelfth chapter to the *Hebrews,*" and in her "Form of Solemnization of Matrimony," it is said, "Marriage is commended of *St. Paul* to be honourable of all men;" *i. e.* in *Hebrews* xiii. 4.

† See Credner, Einleitung in N. T. § 108—208.

‡ Gal. ii. 8.

ought not?* Would he not thus have done what is censured not only by St. Peter but by himself?

2. Besides. Look, they say, at the Epistle itself. St. Paul's Thirteen Epistles bear his name at their commencement; but this to the Hebrews is *anonymous*. Would St. Paul, they inquire, have *omitted* here, what he took care to insert there? Why this inconsistency; especially when so important a point as the authorship of the Epistle was concerned?

3. Further, the tone and style of the Epistle, it is alleged, are not St. Paul's. In his genuine Epistles he speaks with authority, and rebukes with sternness. But, here, for the most part, the language is mild and subdued. Again, in his undisputed Epistles, he writes with impassioned fervour and energetic vigour, and his style is vehement and abrupt. As he himself says, he "came not with excellency of speech,† not with enticing words of men's wisdom," and he says, he "is rude in speech, yet not in knowledge."‡ But the diction of the EIPSTLE to the HEBREWS is remarkable for its polished elegance. Its periods flow in soft and melodious cadences; its arguments are arranged with systematic exactness; and the whole composition is like a laboured masterpiece of a practised Rhetorician.

4. Again, at the close of the Epistle we read, "I beseech you, brethren, suffer the word of exhortation; for I have written to you a letter in few words."§ The Author of the Epistle to the Hebrews, therefore, describes *that* Epistle as a *short* one. But *St. Paul*, in his Epistle to the Galatians, says, "Ye see how large a letter I have written to you with mine own hand."‖ St. Paul, then, calls *that* Epistle a *long* one. But the Epistle to the Hebrews is twice as long as that to the Galatians. How could the *same* person have

* 2 Thess. iii. 11. 1 Pet. iv. 15, ἀλλοτριοεπίσκοποι.
† 1 Cor. ii. 1, 4, 13. ‡ 2 Cor. xi. 6.
§ Heb. xiii. 22. ‖ Gal. vi. 11.

called that to the *Hebrews short*, and that to the *Galatians long?* and since St. Paul wrote that to the Galatians, can the Author of that to the Hebrews be St. Paul?

5. Further, still, it is said, the Eastern and Western Churches *now* receive the Epistle to the Hebrews as inspired, and as the work of St. Paul. But this was *not always* the case. In the second, third, and fourth centuries, (for we speak not now of the *first* century,) the Church of *Rome** did not acknowledge this Epistle as Canonical Scripture; indeed, it was not till the fifth century that the *Italian* Church finally received it as an inspired Book, and as the work of that Apostle.

6. Nor is this all. On this ground of the *non-reception* of this book by the Church of *Rome*, the Divines of *that* Church would persuade us that the *Canon* of the New Testament was not settled till the end of the fourth century or the beginning of the fifth—that is, three hundred years after it was written. Therefore, they allege that Scripture cannot be the Rule of Faith; and that it depends on the Church, (by which they mean the Church of *Rome*,) to decide what *is* Scripture and what is not, and that their present Church might *even now* declare a Book to *be Scripture* which has not hitherto been received as such.

Hence, we perceive the importance of the question—Is the Epistle to the Hebrews the work of St. Paul?

1. We reply, This letter was certainly written very early.

* It is omitted in the Canon Muratorianus; rejected by Caius the Roman Presbyter. Euseb. vi. 20. Hieron. Cat. Script. c. 5 and c. 59, and ad Dardan. p. 608. Ad Esaiam iii. 6. tom. iii. p. 60. Pope Gelasius, recognizes only *thirteen* Epistles of St. Paul. See also the authorities in Routh, Reliquiæ, iv. p. 26. Tertullian, however, though ascribing it to Barnabas, says that it is "receptior apud Ecclesias" than the Pastor of Hermas. (de Pudic. c. 20.)

It is quoted by Polycarp,* the disciple of St. John, and is imitated (as early Christian writers observed, and as examination proves) by St. Clement of Rome, the fellow-labourer of St. Paul,† in the Epistle which Clement wrote in the name of the Church of Rome, of which he was Bishop, to that of Corinth; and which is still extant.

2. The Epistle to the Hebrews was written in St. Paul's lifetime. It speaks of the temple of Jerusalem as still standing, and of the temple worship as still going on.‡ And, though it warns the Church of the doom hanging over Jerusalem, *ye see the Day approaching*,§ yet it is clear from it that the war waged against Jerusalem by Vespasian and Titus had not yet commenced.

Now, this war began in the reign of Nero, and St. Paul was martyred in the *last* year of that emperor;‖ therefore, St. Paul was alive when the Epistle was written. Since, also, the writer promises to visit the Hebrews, in company with Timothy, "Know ye that our brother Timothy is set at liberty, with whom, if he come shortly, I will see you;"¶ it would seem that it was written *before* St. Paul had placed Timothy as Bishop, at Ephesus, which was in the year of our Lord LXIV., two years after his own liberation from his first imprisonment at Rome, with which the history of

* Routh, Eccl. Opusc. p. 23.

† Euseb. iii. 38. Hieron. Script. Eccl. xv. "omninò grandis in utrâque similitudo." The references to the parallel passages are placed side by side in Mr. Jacobson's edition of the Patres Apostolici, p. xi.; and by Professor Stuart, i. 77. 94; and by Mr. Forster in his work on the Apostolical Authority of the Epistle to the Hebrews, Sect. xiii.

‡ Theophyl. Arg. Epist. ad Hebr. ὁ ναὸς ἔτι συνεστήκει.

§ Heb. x. 25.

‖ See the authorities quoted by Bp. Pearson, Annales Paulini, A. D. LXI.—LXVII., and Mr. Clinton's Fasti Romani, pp. 44—48.

¶ Heb. xiii. 23.

the Acts of the Apostles ends; and four years before his second imprisonment and martyrdom, in the same city.

3. This mention of *Timothy*, as *our brother, with whom I will see you*, has been thought by some, among whom it is enough to mention the learned Bp. Pearson,* to be sufficient to indentify the author with St. Paul. For St. Paul often joins Timothy with himself in the addresses of his Epistles, St. Paul called Timothy his *work-fellow*, and three times his *brother;* and St. Timothy is not so styled by *any other* writer of Holy Scripture.

Besides, there was something very appropriate in his being called "*our* brother, or *the* brother," by *St. Paul*, writing to the *Hebrews*. For Timothy was the son of a *Jewess;* and *St. Paul* had shown his charitable condescension to the Hebrew Christians in his particular case. Him —that is, Timothy, we read in the Acts of the Apostles— "would Paul have to go forth with him; and took and circumcised him" (not from any opinion of the necessity of circumcision *at that time*, but from charity†) "because of the Jews which were in those quarters; for they knew all that his father was a Greek."‡

At the same time, by now calling him *his own brother* and theirs, he may be supposed to remind the Hebrews, that in

* Opuscula Posthuma, l. c. viii. p. 59. "Vel ille unicus versiculus, *Cognoscite fratrem nostrum Timotheum dimissum*, &c., satis mihi probat eam Epistolam a Paulo scriptam esse. Neque enim Barnabæ, neque Clementi, neque Lucæ ea verba tribui possunt, tanquam ab eorum aliquo de Timotheo scripta. Cui si adjunxeris testimonium ex secundâ Petri Epistolâ (2 Pet. iii. 16.) a nobis jam allatum, non video quomodo quisquam negare possit eam Epistolam esse Pauli, nisi putet de eâ re semper dubitandum esse de quâ quispiam aliquando dubitaverit."

† See S. Augustine's Correspondence with S. Jerome on this subject. Epist. xxviii. xl. lxxii. lxxv. lxxxi. lxxxii. ed. Bened.

‡ Acts xvi. 3.

Christ Jesus "there is no difference between the Jew and the Greek; but that they are all brethren.

Precisely, in the same manner, St. Paul, writing to the Greek Church of Corinth, calls Titus, who was a Greek, *our brother*.

The expression, therefore, *Timothy our brother*, to say the least, *suggests* St. Paul as the author of the Epistle.

Let us then be allowed, for argument's sake, to suppose that it *was* written by St. Paul; and let us see whether on this hypothesis the phenomena of the Epistle, if we may so call them, may be accounted for, and the difficulties of which we have spoken, as raised against this supposition, may be solved.

1. First, then, as to the alleged impropriety of St. Paul writing to the Hebrews. St. Peter, it is true, *was* the Apostle of the Circumcision; and St. Paul, of the Gentiles. But this did not exclude the one or the other from the care of any part of the Church. Christ's commission to the Apostles, was "Go ye into all the world; preach the Gospel to every Creature." Hence, as St. Peter, the Apostle of the *Jews*, was the first to win *Gentiles* to the Church, so St. Paul, the Apostle of the Gentiles, never ceased to labour for the salvation of the *Jews*.

St. Paul, we say, was the Apostle of *all men*. He had the *care of all the Churches*. "He made himself the Servant of all, that he might gain the more; to the Jews, he became as a Jew; to them that are without the law, he made himself as without the law; he made himself all things to all men, that he might by all means save some."*

Specially was he anxious for the good of the seed of Abraham, for they were his own Kinsmen according to the flesh. "I am a Hebrew of the Hebrews."† "Are they Hebrews?" he exclaims, "so am I. Are they Israelites? so am I. Are they the Seed of Abraham? so am I."‡ There-

* 1 Cor. ix. 19—22. † Phil. iii. 5. ‡ 2 Cor. xi. 22.

fore he says; "Brethren, my heart's desire and prayer to God for Israel is, that they may be saved.* I have great heaviness and continual sorrow in my heart . . . for my brethren, my Kinsmen according to the flesh."† And, if such was his affection for *all* the seed of Abraham, how much more for those among them who were endeared to him by fellow-membership in the body of Christ? He had made collections in all parts of Europe for the relief of the *bodily* wants of *the Saints at Jerusalem;*‡ how much more would he take care to provide for their *souls?*

Besides: as no one was more *zealous* than St. Paul to promote the salvation of his own Kindred, so no one was more *capable* of doing so. He was "a Pharisee, the son of a Pharisee;" he had been brought up at Jerusalem, "at the feet of Gamaliel, and taught according to the perfect manner of the law of the fathers; and after the straitest sect of their religion he had lived a Pharisee." He was, therefore, eminently *qualified* to reason with those of his own nation on the true nature and end of the Mosaic Law; in a word, to handle all those subjects, which are treated with so much learning, eloquence, and wisdom, in the Epistle to the Hebrews.

Upon the whole, so far is it from being the fact that there is any real ground for *surprise* that St. Paul should have written to the *Hebrews*, that we should, on the contrary, rather be disposed to expect that he *would have* written to them, and to feel astonishment *if* he had *not done* so.

2. Let us now open the Epistle.§ The thirteen other

* Rom. x. 1. † Rom. ix. 2, 3.

‡ Ibid. xv. 25. Acts xxiv. 17.

§ S. Chrysostom has discussed this part of the question in a very successful manner in his Introduction to the Epistle to the Hebrews, iv. pp. 427—430. ed. Savile. See also the prefaces of Theodoret, iii. p. 541–3. ed. Hal. 1771, and Theophylact, ii. 647. ed. Bened., who take the same view.

Epistles commence with St. Paul's name; which occurs no where in this. . . . But is it not therefore St. Paul's?

St. Paul had good reasons for *prefixing* his name to *them*. Might there not be equally good reasons that his name should be *withheld* here?

He prefixed it where *it is* prefixed, in order to assure those who received the Epistles, that they came from him; and to call their attention to what he had to say as an Apostle of Christ.

Besides; these Epistles, be it observed, were written to *Gentiles;* and forasmuch as he was the Apostle of the Gentiles, he magnified his office, and claimed to be heard by them in virtue of it.

But his circumstances, in addressing the *Hebrews*, were very different from those under which he wrote to the *Gentiles*.

It is true, indeed, that it was necessary that the person from whom the Epistle came should not be unknown, in order that its reception might be insured. And they whom the author of the Epistle to the Hebrews desired to assure of the fact, knew well the hand from which that Epistle came. This is clear from the words in the Epistle, "Pray for us, that I may be restored to you; Know ye that our brother Timothy is set at liberty, with whom, if he comes shortly, I will see you."

These expressions, I say, *prove* that they to whom the Epistle was sent in the first instance, knew from whom it came; and, doubtless, the bearer of the Epistle informed them by *whom* he was sent.

We shall see in the sequel that there was another, and, as I think, sure criterion in the letter itself, by which they might know whose it was.

Besides; it is certain that this Epistle would never have been read as SCRIPTURE in the Church of Jerusalem, and in

all the Eastern Churches, as we know it was from the days* of St. Paul, unless the Bishops and Presbyters of these Churches had known *who* its author was, and that he was *inspired* by God.

It is clear, therefore, that the name of the writer was withheld, not from any view of entire secrecy, much less for any clandestine or surreptitious purpose; and that the author was well known to his friends, and could be known by all who might inquire of them.

But this Epistle was intended, not only for friends, but for lukewarm waverers, for Judaizing Christians, and for unchristianized Jews,—that is, for *false brethren* and for *inveterate foes.*

Now, *St. Paul's* name was obnoxious to Judaizing Christians on account of the bold and uncompromising manner in which (as is recorded in the second chapter of the Epistle to the Galatians,) he had acted at Antioch, when he *rebuked St. Peter openly to his face*, for abstaining from eating with the Gentile converts, through fear of *those of the Circumcision*, who came down from Jerusalem; many of whom desired to be both Jews and Christians, and so in fact were neither Jews nor Christians.

St. Paul was abhorred by the unconverted Jews as a renegade. The last time we hear of his being at Jerusalem, more than forty of them had banded themselves together under an oath, that they would neither eat nor drink till they had killed Paul. "Of the Jews five times received I forty stripes save one." Now what emotions would have been excited in their breasts by the name of *Paul!* They

* Theodoret. Arg. in Epist. ad Hebr. speaks of its being read in the Churches from the Apostolic times, ἐξ οὐ τῶν ἀποστολικῶν γραμμάτων αἱ τοῦ Θεοῦ μετέλαχον ἐκκλησίαι. He quotes Eusebius, saying, that "*all the ancients* acknowledged it to be St. Paul's:" and says that the Arians had then *begun* to question its genuineness, on account of the testimony it gives to the Divinity of our Blessed Lord.

would have recoiled from it with scorn and execration. The sight of it would have deterred them from reading an Epistle to which it was prefixed. They would have felt indignant that Paul the Christian, whom they had known as Saul of Tarsus, and whom they scorned and execrated as an apostate, should presume to write to the *Hebrews!* The very sound of the name *Paul* would have roused a crowd of angry feelings and bitter prejudices in their minds. Thus, in their case, the prefixing of the name to the Epistle would have almost frustrated the purpose for which it was written.

St. Paul had been taught by his Master CHRIST that the time would come when men would hate His Disciples, and cast out their name as evil. He had learnt also from Christ not to cast his pearls before swine; and to unite the wisdom of the serpent with the harmlessness of the dove. Christ displayed by His own example what He taught by precept; He witnessed a good confession before Pontius Pilate. But when, on one occasion, the men of His own city, Nazareth, had sought to throw Him down from the brow of the hill on which their city was built, Jesus, passing through the midst of them, went His way. And when at another time, the Jews took up stones to cast at Him, He hid Himself, and went out of the Temple, going through the midst of them, and so passed by.

On many occasions, He charged the spectators of His merciful and mighty works not *to make Him known*, lest they might prematurely provoke the jealousy and malice of His enemies. He would not throw any stumbling-block in their way; He would deliver them, as far as He was concerned, from all temptations to sin.

So St. Paul; he shrunk from no necessary avowal of the truth, but he would not gratuitously excite the least prejudice; he courted no unnecessary perils; and, in a spirit of holy prudence and divine charity, he did all in his power to make Truth acceptable and attractive, even to its worst foes.

His language was, "Let no man put a stumbling-block in another's way. Give none offence, neither to the Jews, nor to the Gentiles, nor to the Church of God. Give no offence in any thing, that the Ministry be not blamed."

On the one hand, he would make no compromise with error; on the other, he would sacrifice himself for the erring.

He knew that the Cross was a stumbling-block to the Jews, and foolishness to the Greeks; but yet he would glory in the Cross alone, and would know nothing but Christ, and Him crucified; he would affirm that the offence of the Cross should never cease; And why? Because men could not be saved without it. But he would be content "never to eat flesh as long as the world stood, if his meat made his brother to offend."

He would not, therefore, *withhold* his Name where his Name was necessary. Nay, he would seal his testimony to the truth, not only with his Name, but with his blood. But he would not *obtrude* his Name where it was likely to provoke hatred and other sinful passions, and to repel any from those saving truths which he had been commanded by Christ to preach.

Assuredly, then, there were very good reasons why St. Paul, (supposing *him* to have been the author of this Epistle,) should *not* have prefixed his name to it. And, since these reasons do not apply with any thing like the same force to *any one* else as they do to St. Paul, therefore, the very *non-appearance* of the Author's name in the Epistle to the *Hebrews*, instead of *diminishing*, does in fact, *increase* the probability, that its author is ST. PAUL.*

But I will pause here for the present, and reserve my further observations to the next Discourse.

* See this argument very well stated by the African Bishop Primasius, in the Appendix E. to this Volume.

LECTURE IX.

2 Pet. iii. 15, 16.

"*Even as our beloved brother Paul, according to the wisdom given unto him, hath written unto you; as also in all his Epistles, speaking in them of these things; in which are some things hard to be understood, which they that are unlearned and unstable wrest, as they do also the other Scriptures, unto their own destruction.*"

We pass now to another point,—the tone of the Epistle to the Hebrews.

3. It is true that the writer does not speak in the same authoritative language as is employed by St. Paul in his Epistles. He exhorts and implores, rather than rebukes and commands. But is not this precisely what might have been expected from St. Paul addressing the *Jews?* They required to be treated with the greatest delicacy and circumspection, especially by *him*. Some of the Jewish *Christians*, too, might resent the interference of any other teacher than St. Peter or St. James, on the ground that they were committed to *their* charge.

In order, as it seems, to obviate this objection, the Author of the Epistle to the Hebrews does not write to the *Rulers* of the Jewish Church; and he inculcates very strongly on the Hebrews, more than once, the duty of obedience to their Rulers; thus intimating that he wrote with their sanction, perhaps at their request.

Others, who might be aware that the Epistle was from St. Paul, might *scorn* the exhortations of one who had been notorious at Jerusalem as a *persecutor and injurious*, and had been instrumental in shedding the blood of the first Christian Martyr, St. Stephen, among those to whom he now addressed an Epistle, in behalf of the faith which he had caused others to blaspheme.

Can it be wondered at, that St. Paul, writing under such circumstances, should speak in a tone of mildness, gentleness, and humility? The remembrance of his own past life in Jerusalem must have inspired him with a penitential spirit of forbearance. It is hardly possible to imagine a more difficult task, one requiring more delicacy and tenderness,—than that to be performed by a person in the situation of St. Paul writing to the Hebrews.

4. Next, as to the alleged discrepancy in the expressions to the Galatians and to the Hebrews.

In the last chapter of the Epistle to the Galatians, St. Paul says, "Ye see how large a letter I have written to you with mine own hand." At the close of the Epistle to the Hebrews, the Author says, "Suffer the Word of exhortation, for I have written to you a letter in few words." Can, then, it is asked, the Author of the Epistle to the Hebrews be St. Paul?

To this we reply, This discrepancy is imaginary. As has been already observed,* the Epistle to the *Galatians* is the only one which St. Paul wrote with his *own hand*. The rest were dictated by him to an amanuensis; and *subscribed* with a salutation at the end in his own hand. "The Salutation by the hand of me Paul: which is the token in every Epistle. So I write."†

The Epistle, then, to the Galatians, though comparatively a short one, was a long one for St. Paul to write with his

* Lecture VII. p. 147. † 2 Thess. iii. 17.

own hand; and the Epistle to the Hebrews, though comparatively a long one, was not a long one to be dictated to another.

5. Let us now consider the objection from alleged discrepancy of *style* between the Epistle to the Hebrews and the acknowledged Epistles of St. Paul.

It cannot be denied that the Epistle to the Hebrews *is* eminently distinguished among *all* the books of the New Testament by the purity and elegance of its language, the graceful flow of its periods, the skillful disposition of its parts, and the oratorical treatment of the subject.

This did not escape the notice of ancient Christian Critics, especially that of the learned Origen, who, maintaining that the Epistle is St. Paul's, conjectured that, while the *substance* of the Epistle to the Hebrews is his, the *diction* might, perhaps, be the work of some *other* person, whom the Apostle employed to clothe his sentiments in words.

This hypothesis is ingenious, and, if admitted, would not affect the Canonical authority of the Epistle. For we know from Scripture, that the Holy Spirit has been pleased to operate in *Interpretation* of tongues, as well as in original *dictation;* and to show His power not only in inspiring the heart and guiding the hand of *one* and the *same* man, but also, if we may so speak, in making one man's mouth the organ of another's heart; and it would be enough for us to know that *St. Paul* had *approved* the Epistle to the Hebrews as expressing *his own mind*, and that it had been delivered by him as Scripture to the Church, and from him received by her as such.

It may here be remarked, that there is a great discrepancy of style between the *first* and *second* Epistles of *St. Peter;* and that St. Jerome, led perhaps by Origen's hypothesis concerning the Epistle to the Hebrews, endeavoured to account for *this* discrepancy, by saying that St. Peter had

employed two different Interpreters or Secretaries for the composition of his two Epistles.

There is also a marked difference of style between the Apocalypse and St. John's Gospel and Epistles.

This, too, attracted attention in ancient times; it was the subject of a special dissertation from the pen of one of the most celebrated of Origen's scholars, Dionysius, Bishop of Alexandria,* who, while he asserted in strong terms the *Inspiration* of the Apocalypse, expressed some doubt as to its being the work of *St. John.*†

Thus, we see, that in the New Testament there are three different writings, commonly ascribed to three Apostles, St. Paul, St. Peter, and St. John, respectively, on the ground of external and internal testimony, and yet *differing* in *style* from their acknowledged writings, and on the strength of *that* difference, *certain* critics of eminence have been inclined to *withdraw*, either partially or entirely, these writings from these three Apostles. In two of these three cases, the genuineness of the *words* alone, and in the third case, the genuineness of the *words* and *substance* has been questioned.

If, now, it can be shown that, notwithstanding this discrepancy of style, *one* of these three writings does really belong wholly and solely to the Apostle whose claim to its authorship is questioned, not only would *that* claim be established, but we should also have advanced far towards refuting the argument from discrepancy of style against the substantial and verbal genuineness of the other two.

Now, this may be shown, as it appears to me, with respect to the Epistle of St. Peter, and also the Epistle to the Hebrews.

The language of the Author of the Second Epistle, ascribed to St. Peter, seems altogether to *forbid* the supposition, that the *words* of that Epistle did *not* come from

* Euseb. vii. 25. † See Lardner, Credibility, i. 634. sqq.

the same person as the *ideas*. He says expressly, "This Second Epistle, beloved, I now write unto you,"* just as it said in the first Epistle, I write† to you by Silvanus a faithful brother, as I judge; in both cases this Word implies, I apprehend, *verbal* authorship. If this be so, I would observe, that the case of discrepancy of style between St. Peter's two Epistles is *much more* striking than that of discrepancy between the Epistle to the *Hebrews* and *St. Paul's* acknowledged Epistles.

For both St. Peter's Epistles (as appears from the first verse of the third chapter of the Second Epistle) were addressed to the *same persons* at nearly the *same time;* whereas, St. Paul's thirteen Epistles are written to *one* class of persons, and the Epistle to the *Hebrews*, to *another* class; and the parallel between his case and St. Peter's *would* only hold, *if* we had an undoubted Epistle of *St. Paul* to the *Hebrews;* and even then, supposing *that* differed from our Epistle, the discrepancy between St. Peter's two Epistles, written at *the same time* to the same parties, would make us hesitate before we questioned the genuineness of our Epistle, on the ground of style alone.

We will not dwell longer on the argument from St. Peter's Epistle; for the case of the Epistle to the Hebrews may well stand by itself: and we now proceed to observe, that so far from being surprised at a discrepancy between an Epistle written to *Hebrew* Christians, and Epistles written to *Gentile* Christians, we ought rather to *expect* a discrepancy; and it may also be affirmed, that there is *not* a greater difference of style between the Epistle to the Hebrews, and *some* of the *acknowledged* Epistles of St.

* ταύτην ἤδη δευτέραν ὑμῖν γράφω ἐπιστολήν. 2 Pet. iii. 1.

† ἔγραψα. 1 Pet. v. 12. Like "scribebam" or "scripsi," in Latin—where we should say, "I write." Silvanus was the bearer of the Epistle.

Paul, for example, those to the Ephesians and Colossians, than there is between these two Epistles and *other* acknowledged Epistles of St. Paul; for instance, that to the Galatians.

For this and other reasons, considering St. Paul merely as an ordinary writer, we would maintain that the objection on the ground of style to the genuineness of the Epistle to the Hebrews, is of little value.

Authors *uninspired can* write, and *do* write, in different styles on different occasions, just as great Masters paint in different manners. What can be more different than the Odes and Satires of Horace? But not to multiply instances, let me refer only to the writings of a celebrated Christian Father, St. Cyprian. His Epistle to Donatus, which is found in his works, is written in a florid and exuberant style, totally different from that of his other writings, so that a critic who would decide from style, would immediately pronounce that it is not his.

Yet his fellow-countryman, St. Augustine, assures us of its genuineness; and speaks thus of it; "St. Cyprian, by writing *once* in this style, showed us that he *could* write thus if he chose to do so; but by *not* writing thus *more* than once, he proved that he did not choose to do, what he had shown once that he could do."*

Now, we are speaking, be it observed, not of badness or goodness of style, but simply of *difference* of style. St. Cyprian, we see, wrote very *differently* in *one* work from what he did in *all* his other works; and who will say that what *St. Cyprian could, St. Paul could not* do?

What, now, is the peculiarity in style of the Epistle to the Hebrews?

It is, as Origen expresses it, its Grecian composition.† But St. Paul was born and bred in a learned Grecian Colony, and, in his Epistles, he shows his familiarity‡ with

* S. Aug. de Doct. Christ. iv. 31. † Euseb. vi. 25.

‡ Tit. i. 12. Acts xvii. 28. 1 Cor. xv. 33.

Greek Poets, and by certain parts of some of his Epistles, he has proved that it was by choice and *design* that he did *not* write in the polished language of his Greek and Asiatic contemporaries, and that he *could* have written, as they did, *if* he had thought fit to do so.

It may be reasonably assumed that St. Paul would do what was most conducive to the end in view. The style in which the Epistle to the Hebrews is written, was the best suited for the purpose of that Epistle. This may be concluded from the excellence of the work, proving the wisdom of its author, whoever the writer may be, and from its reception in the Church, proving its Inspiration. The fitness of the style used is proved by the fact of its use. And, therefore, we may conclude that St. Paul would have used it as being the best suited for the purpose.

But you may say, *why* did he not therefore write in this style in his other Epistles?

I reply as follows:—

To the *Corinthians* and the *Greeks* generally, who idolized human eloquence, his preaching was "not with excellency of speech nor with enticing words of man's wisdom, but in demonstration of the Spirit and of power," in order, as he himself says, that their faith "should not stand in the wisdom of men, but in the power of God;" and that it might not be alleged, that "their conversion, through *his* means, had been the learning and skill which he had by being conversant in book, whereas the *other Apostles*," who had no such learning and skill, "prevailed because God was with them."* No one should say that Paul had ministered excitement to them, and had fascinated them by Rhetoric, and that, like a crafty Greek retailer,† he had adulterated the pure Gospel to suit their taste. The Apostle, therefore,

* See Hooker, iii. viii. 10, whose words these are.

† κάπηλος. οὐ γάρ ἐσμεν ὡς οἱ πολλοὶ, καπηλεύοντες, κ. τ. λ. See Bentley's admirable Sermon on this text, 2 Cor. ii. 17.

abstained from writing to them in a *polished* style. He would win them to the faith by solecisms.

But the *Hebrews* were a very different audience. Their Septuagint Version was full of exotic words and barbarous idioms. They could not be spoilt by the graces of a polished style. There was no danger of it being said of them that they had been charmed into Christianity by eloquence. And by writing to *them* in the style in which the Epistle to the Hebrews is written, St. Paul would prove to the *world* that he had *not* written in a similar style to his Greek and Asiatic converts, *not* because he was *unable*, but because he was *unwilling* to do so.

The Greeks, then, in reading, as they would do, the Epistle to the Hebrews, would learn the reasons for which St. Paul wrote to the Greeks, for the most part, as he did; they would thence derive a higher opinion of St. Paul's character, and of the truths which he taught; and the Hebrews, in turning to St. Paul's Epistles to the Gentiles, would rejoice to find in them the fervour and the force of their own Prophets, and they would thence learn to value the more what St. Paul wrote to themselves.

Thus, we say, St. Paul, in being as it were a Hebrew to the Greeks, and a Greek to the Hebrews, served the cause of both.

The question, therefore, returns: *Could he* have written in the style, in which the Epistle to the Hebrews is written? I have already stated his natural qualifications for doing so, and have endeavoured to show that the Hebrew tone, if we may so call it, of his Epistles to Greek and Asiatic Churches, by no means diminishes the probability that he could or would write in a Greek tone to the Hebrews.

There were many reasons, as we have shown, why St. Paul should write to the Hebrews; and he spake *with Tongues more than all* the rest, and, such being the case, it may well be supposed, that whatever he required, beyond

his natural qualifications, to enable him to write in the style in which the Epistle to the Hebrews is written, would be supplied to the Apostle by the DIVINE SPIRIT, who with the gift of Tongues, gave him also the power of using them in divers manners, according to the exigencies of the case. "For all these worketh that one and selfsame Spirit, dividing to every man severally as He will."

On the whole, then, it does not appear to be so reasonable to infer a difference of authorship,—either in words or ideas, from a discrepancy of style between the Epistle to the Hebrews and some of St. Paul's Epistles, as to conclude from the discrepancy of style, that there was an adequate reason for such discrepancy, and to recognize the wisdom of the Apostle and of the Divine Spirit, by whom He was guided, in the choice of means best suited to the nature of the ends.

The principle of this observation, may, I think, be extended to the Second Epistle of St. Peter and the Apocalypse; but on these, more may be said on another occasion, and we return to the Epistle to the Hebrews.

6. Though the discrepancy of style which subsists between it and St. Paul's acknowledged Epistles, does not affect its genuineness, yet, let me here add, if it be genuine, we may well expect to find a certain similarity of *mind* and *manner* between it and his undoubted Epistles.

And we do find this similarity in fact.

There is a marked resemblance in the use of particular words and phrases, of which there are many which are found in the Epistle to the Hebrews, and in the acknowledged writings of St. Paul, and in no *other* books of the New Testament.

Abundant evidence has been given of this fact by a learned writer,* in his elaborate work on the Apostolical Authority of the Epistle to the Hebrews.

* Rev. C. Forster, B. D. London, 1838. Sections i.—iv.

It may be mentioned, by way of illustration here, that the insignificant particle τε (*and*) affords a remarkable specimen of this verbal coincidence. This convenient conjunction is, I believe, never or scarcely ever used by St. Peter, nor by his disciple St. Mark; it is not used more than ten times by all the other writers in the New Testament, *except* St. Luke and his companion and master St. Paul, by whom together it is used about 180 times; and it is very often used in the Epistle to the Hebrews.

7. The *verbal* and *idiomatic* coincidences between St. Paul's Epistles and the Epistle to the Hebrews have been fully displayed in the admirable work to which I have just referred; and I proceed to add a few words on the similarity of *mind* and *manner* in the one and the other.

A former Master of one of our Colleges, and one of our greatest Divines, Dr. Barrow, has the following just remark at the commencement of one of his Sermons:* "It is," he says, "the *manner* of St. Paul in his Epistles, *after* that he hath discussed some main points of *doctrine* or *discipline*, to propose several good advices and rules, in the observance whereof the *life* of Christian *practice* doth consist. So that he thereby hath furnished us with so rich a variety of moral and spiritual precepts concerning special matters, subordinate to the general Rules of Piety and Virtue, that out of them might well be compiled a Body of Ethics, or system of precepts, *de officiis*, in truth and completeness far excelling those which any philosophy hath been able to devise or deliver. These he rangeth not in any formal method, nor linketh together with strict connection, but freely *scattereth* them so as from his mind (as out of a fertile soil impregnated with all *seeds* of wisdom and goodness) they did haply spring up, or as they were suggested by that Holy Spirit, which continually guided and governed him."

Such are the words of Dr. Barrow. For an example of

* Serm. VI. On the duty of Prayer, i. p. 69, ed. 1683.

this truth, it may suffice to refer to the *ethical* conclusion of St. Paul's great *dogmatic* Epistle, the EPISTLE to the ROMANS. At the close of its eleventh chapter, he passes from the region of spiritual doctrine, and (to adopt Dr. Barrow's figure) begins to sow the precepts of moral practice. He scatters the seed thickly, and, as some would say, almost at random.

Now, if we turn to the close of the EPISTLE to the HEBREWS, we find precisely the same thing. Near the end of the twelfth chapter, the author passes from doctrine to practice; the *seed* sown here is very much the same as in the Epistle to the Romans, and the *manner* of sowing is the same. The latter parts of these two Epistles are like two gardens cultivated by the same hand. That hand, I believe, was St. Paul's.

Let me notice a peculiar characteristic in them both. You remember, in the Epistle to the Romans, the verse, "Let love be without dissimulation, abhor that which is evil, cleave to that which is good."* As these words stand in English, there is nothing remarkable in their construction. But the construction of the *original is very* remarkable: ἡ ἀγάπη ἀνυπόκριτος, ἀποστυγοῦντες τὸ πονηρὸν, κολλώμενοι τῷ ἀγαθῷ. Here we have two *nominatives absolute;* and, what is still more remarkable, we have a *noun feminine nominative absolute,* (ἡ ἀγάπη ἀνυπόκριτος) branching out suddenly into a *participle masculine nominative absolute* (ἀποστυγοῦντες τὸ πονηρὸν, κολλώμενοι τῷ ἀγαθῷ.) If I mistake not, another instance of this construction can hardly be found in the New Testament, except in *one* place.† And that is the parallel practical portion to which I have just adverted, at the close of the EPISTLE to the HEBREWS.‡

* English Version, xii. 9.

† Something similar occurs in another of St. Paul's Epistles, 2 Cor. ix. 10. ὑμῶν, πλουτιζόμενοι. See also v. 12, 13. περισσεύουσα, δοξαζόμενοι.

‡ Heb. xiii. 5.

There we read, "Let your conversation be without covetousness, and be ye content with such things as ye have." The original here is, ἀφιλάργυρος ὁ τρόπος, ἀρκούμενοι τοῖς παροῦσιν.

This remarkable construction, let it also be observed, has this peculiar value, that it seems to point to the Apostle St. Paul as the Author of the *language* of the Epistle to the Hebrews, in which it is found, while the whole Chapter identifies him with the *substance*. Nor is this all. If we turn back to the passage in the Epistle to the Romans, we find that the precept, being joined on as it were by stalks and branches with other similar precepts, has its *root*, if I may so say, in a *text* of *Holy Scripture*,—"For it is written, Vengeance is mine, I will repay, saith the Lord." So the precept in the Epistle to the Hebrews: "Be content with such things as ye have, for He hath said, I will never leave thee nor forsake thee."

Not only, therefore, is the seed sown, and the manner of sowing, in the Epistle to the Hebrews very like that of St. Paul, in his known Epistles; but there is a mode,—an *unique* mode, may I call it,—of *grafting*, also, in the one and the other; whence we infer, that, of the Hebrews also the Apostle St. Paul might have said, "Ye are God's husbandry; we are labourers together with him: I have planted, I have watered, and God hath given the increase."

8. Before we quit the argument from *internal* evidence, let me invite your attention to certain other points in the Epistle which seem to identify the author with St. Paul.

The writer says, at the commencement, "God, who spake in times past to our fathers;" and he cites numberless passages from the Old Testament; but in no one case does he cite them as *written*, but always as *spoken*. This, as is known, is the way in which Jews writing to Jews quote Scripture.* The author, therefore, was of Jewish extraction, as St. Paul was.

* St. Matthew, for instance, always introduces his quotations as *said*. See Townson's works, i. 101.

I have already spoken of his reference to his brother Timothy. The author speaks of his bonds.* St. Paul was in prisons frequently, in deaths oft. The author says that he will shortly visit them. St. Paul, we know, was just set at liberty, when this Epistle appears to have been written. The author says, "They of Italy salute you."† St. Paul was in Italy at the time this letter appears to have been sent; and he wrote several Epistles there. The writer promises to visit those to whom he writes, and desires their prayers, that he may be restored to them. This St. Paul does frequently. The author declares that he "trusts he has a good conscience;" this is St. Paul's usual language also.‡

9. Further, let me call your attention to the following circumstance. St. Paul, it is true, has *prefixed* his *name* to thirteen of his Epistles; and thus he has given us one criterion whereby we may be assured of their genuineness; and this *initial* guarantee does *not* appear in the Epistle to the *Hebrews;* and I have endeavoured to account for its *absence.*

But let me now remind you, that there was *another* token by which St. Paul avouched his Epistles; not an *initial* but a *final* one; I mean his Apostolic *salutation* at the *close* of his Epistles. "The salutation of Paul with mine own hand; which is the token in every Epistle. So I write."

Now, it may be asked, in *what* did this salutation consist? If we examine *the thirteen Epistles*, to which the name of St. Paul is prefixed, we find that, near their *conclusion*, they all contain (with some merely verbal variations) the phrase, "*The Grace of our Lord Jesus Christ be with you;*" and St. Paul himself indicates that *this* Apostolic Benediction is

* Heb. x. 34. If δεσμοῖς is the true reading, which is most probable.

† This, after all that has been said to the contrary, seems to be the true translation of οἱ ἀπ' Ἰταλίας; like "Pastor ab Amphryso." The other version ("They who are come from Italy,") gives no very intelligible idea: γράφει τὴν ἐπιστολὴν ἀπὸ Ἰταλίας, says Theophylact.

‡ Acts xxiii. 1; xxiv. 16. 2 Cor. i. 12. 2 Tim. i. 3.

what he means by *the salutation of me Paul;* for, in the passage which I have just quoted, he says, "The salutation of Paul with mine own hand, which is the token in every Epistle: so I write," and then he adds immediately, "The Grace of our Lord Jesus Christ be with you all." These words, then, "*the Grace of our Lord Jesus Christ,*" were St. Paul's *salutation, written by his own hand.* This was a token by which all his Epistles were to be known. And a most beautiful and interesting token it is!

10. I would further remark that *this* salutation, found at the close of *every one* of St. Paul's Thirteen Epistles, is *not* found in any one of the Epistles of any *other* Apostle, written in St. Paul's lifetime. It is employed by others after his death. It *is* used in the last book of the New Testament, the Apocalypse, and also, by St. Clement of Rome. Hence we see, it was not only adopted by St. Paul as his own badge, but, being known by others to be so, it was reserved to him by his brethren during his life. Soon after his death, it was used by others, and it has now become the ordinary conclusion of sermons and liturgies, in all parts of Christendom. And *this* salutation employed by St. Paul as his own criterion in *each* of his *Thirteen* Epistles, and not used by any other Apostle, in St. Paul's life, *is* found in the EPISTLE to the HEBREWS, which ends thus: "They of Italy salute you: *Grace be with you all, Amen."

Therefore, we conclude, the Epistle to the Hebrews was written by St. Paul.

11. Let us now test this hypothesis by *external* evidence.

The Epistle to the Hebrews was sent to the Church of Jerusalem, the Mother of all Churches, and was diffused from Jerusalem, which was the centre of the Jewish, and the

* The original has more precisely ἡ χάρις . . . *the* grace, *i. e.* of our Lord Jesus Christ, be with you.

source of the Christian Religion. To the testimony, therefore, of the Church of Jerusalem, and of the other Churches of the East, we must appeal for authentic information concerning the Epistle to the Hebrews.

Now it is unquestionable, that this Epistle was read in the Churches of the East from the time in which it was written, and was received by them as a genuine and inspired writing of the Apostle St. Paul.

Who can be better witnesses on this subject than St. Irenæus and St. Cyril? The former, the scholar of Polycarp, cites the Epistle as inspired and as St. Paul's.* The latter, the Bishop of Jerusalem, in his catechetical Lectures, gives the names of the Books of the Old and New Testaments, and among them he recites the *fourteen* Epistles of St. Paul, and affirms that the Books which he enumerates were delivered down as he describes them, in an uninterrupted succession, by the *primitive* Bishops, and by *the Apostles themselves.*

Who, again, a more competent witness than St. Jerome, living in Palestine, at Bethlehem, in the fourth century, whose opinion is of the greater value, not only on account of his vast erudition, but because he came from *Rome*, and brought with him from the *West* the prejudices of the Latin Church of his age against the Epistle to the Hebrews; prejudices no doubt occasioned by the fact that the heretical doctrines of the Montanistic and Novatian† teachers in the West, concerning the impossibility of renewing unto repent-

* Euseb. v. 26, and the fragments published by Pfaffius, pp. 26, 119.

† See Kirchofer, Geschichte des Canons, 240, 243, 247, 425; and S. Hieron. adv. Jovinian. ii. p. 195. S. Ambrose de Pœnit. ii. 2, acknowledges the Epistle as St. Paul's, and vindicates the sixth chapter from the Novatian misinterpretation. It is also ascribed to St. Paul in the Synopsis Scripturæ, which bears the name of S. Athanasius, ii. p. 53.

ance a second time after the commission of heinous sins, were grounded on their interpretation of the earlier verses of the Sixth Chapter of this Epistle.

St. Jerome, then, bears witness that the Epistle to the Hebrews was received as St. Paul's by all the Churches of the East, and by all the Greek Christian writers from primitive times, and he himself receives it as such;* and it cannot be doubted that the testimony and authority of the great western Doctor, St. Jerome, was mainly instrumental in *correcting* the judgment and practice of the *Roman* Church, and in restoring to *her* the Epistle to the Hebrews.

To the witness of the Church at Jerusalem may be added, as we have said, that of all the Churches of the East not only individually, but assembled in Synods, at Antioch,† Nicæa, and Laodicea; and when we bear in mind that these Churches were for the most part planted by St. Paul, and governed in the first instance by persons appointed by him, as Timothy, Titus, and others, their testimony amounts almost to an assurance from St. Paul himself.

But there is one Church, not founded by St. Paul, whose evidence is of peculiar value,—the Church of Alexandria.

This Church was eminent for the great learning and critical acumen of its earlier teachers, and therefore its judgment is of greater weight. St. Athanasius, Bishop of Alexandria, in the fourth century, unhesitatingly received this Epistle to the Hebrews as St. Paul's.‡ Before him, two of the most learned writers of that Church, Origen, and his teacher, Clement, of Alexandria, did the same. Their evidence is more interesting, because it is clear that they had carefully considered the subject, and were eminently qualified to judge of compositions in their own language.

* Epist. ad Dardan. ii. p. 608.

† The Peschito or ancient Syriac version recognizes this Epistle as St. Paul's.

‡ Epist. Festal. xxxix. Idem Decr. Syn. Nic. i. pp. 265, 266, 268.

"The style," says Origen,* "of the Epistle to the Hebrews has not that plainness which was characteristic of the Apostle Paul, who confessed himself to be rude in speech; and any one who is capable of judging concerning style, must allow that it has more of a Grecian air in its composition† than his other Epistles; but, on the other hand, every one who is conversant with the Apostle's writings must also confess that the sentiments of this Epistle are magnificent and the conceptions not inferior to those of any of the received works of St. Paul."

"My own opinion," he adds, "is this; the diction and texture of the expressions are the work of some one who committed to paper what was delivered orally by his Master, the Apostle St. Paul. Whatever Church, therefore, receives this Epistle as St. Paul's, let it be honored for so doing, for it was not without good reason, that the primitive writers‡ delivered it to us as his: but *who* committed it to writing is known to God; the history that has come down to us is that this was done either by Clement, the Bishop of Rome, or by St. Luke, who wrote the Acts and the Gospel."

In another place Origen reckons *fourteen* Epistles of St. Paul. Therefore he received the Epistle to the Hebrews as his.

Such is the testimony of Origen. His master, Clement of Alexandria, thus speaks:§ "The Epistle to the Hebrews is the work of St. Paul; it was composed by him in Hebrew,

* Ap. Euseb. vi. 25. Origen cites this Epistle more than two hundred times in his extant works; and expressly recognizes it as his in numerous places, viz. in his Epist. ad Afric. i. p. 19. See Kirchhofer. p. 244.

† Ἑλληνικωτέρα τῇ συνθέσει. ‡ Οἱ ἀρχαῖοι ἄνδρες.

§ Euseb. vi. 14. See also Clement's Adumbrationes ad 1 Pet. Epist. "Lucas Pauli ad Hebræos interpretatus Epistolam;" and his Stromata vi. p. 645, where he quotes the Epistle as St. Paul's.

and translated by St. Luke into Greek:* hence the resemblance between its style and that of the Acts of the Apostles. St. Paul did not prefix his name and title, 'Paul an Apostle,' to it; with good reason,—for he was addressing those who were prejudiced against him; and therefore he prudently withheld his name, lest he should deter them from reading it. Besides, as a holy presbyter used to say to me,† since our Blessed Lord was specially the Apostle‡ of the people of Israel, therefore, through a spirit of reverence, St. Paul did not assume this title in writing to them; and because also he was specially the Apostle of the *Gentiles*."

These testimonies of Clement and Origen appear to be more valuable even on account of the private theories—in the case of Clement, of a *Hebrew* original, and in that of Origen, of a distinct Author of the language—by which these testimonies are accompanied. It is clear that these theories were suggested by what we have already considered, I mean the *discrepancy of style* between the Epistle to the Hebrews, and the undisputed Epistles of St. Paul. And this discrepancy which generated these theories *would* doubtless have tempted them to assign the Epistle to some other person than St. Paul, *if they had been able*, in conscience, to do so. The evidence of the *Pauline* origin of the Epistle must have been very strong to *force* them upon these theories. Let us observe, also, that these theories are only private opinions, and are propounded as such, and do not now require further notice, except as they are convertible into important testimonies to the genuineness of the Epistle.

These testimonies are from persons born only a little more

* This seems to be disproved by numerous paronomasias: πολυμερῶς πολυτρόπως ἀπάτωρ ἀμήτωρ κ. τ. λ., bearing evidence of an original.

† Supposed to be Pantænus. See Appendix E.

‡ It is observable that the author of the Epistle so calls Him, Heb. iii. 1; and He is not called so by any other writer in the New Testament.

than a century after the Epistle was written; and as they ground what they say on the testimony of the *ancients*, and as *their ancients* must have been contemporary with the Apostles, we are brought back by their testimony to the times of St. Paul himself.

Such then is the testimony which we receive from Alexandria.*

Now, be it remembered that the Church of Alexandria was founded by St. Mark,† whom *St. Peter* calls his son, and who was with St. Paul at Rome in his first imprisonment, and for whom he sent in his second imprisonment‡ just before his death, because he was profitable to him for the ministry; and we know that St. Mark was present at Rome at St. Paul's and St. Peter's martyrdom.§ The testimony, therefore, of the Church of Alexandria, may be regarded as the testimony of St. Mark; and the testimony of St. Mark is that of St. Peter and St. Paul.

This, I say, is a probable supposition; and it is confirmed by the language of our text, which is from the second Epistle of Peter the teacher of St. Mark, and the brother Apostle and fellow-martyr of St. Paul. This second Epistle was written by St. Peter a very short time before his death, and like his First Epistle,‖ was addressed by him, the Apostle of the Circumcision, to the *Hebrew* converts of the East.¶

St. Peter there says, "As our beloved brother Paul, according to the wisdom given unto him, has written unto you;" therefore St. Paul had written to *those persons* whom

* Other early Alexandrian witnesses, to the same effect, might be adduced. *e. g.* S. Dionys. ap. Euseb. vi. 41, Alexander ap. Socr. H. E. i. 3, both these were Bishops of Alexandria.

† S. Hieron. de Viris Illust. xxxvi. Alexandriæ a Marco Evangelistâ semper Ecclesiastici fuere doctores. Euseb. v. 10.

‡ 2 Tim. iv. 11. § Iren. 3. 1.

‖ See 2 Pet. iii. 1.

¶ See Bp. Pearson, Opera Posthuma, Diss. I. viii. p. 59=p. 358, ed. Churton.

St. Peter then addressed. And who were they? *Hebrews.** Therefore there was *some* Epistle of St. Paul to the Hebrews. Therefore that inscribed to the Hebrews, and received as his by the Church of Jerusalem and by the Eastern Churches, was written by St. Paul.

Further: St. Peter, in the text, divides St. Paul's Epistles into two classes: "as our beloved brother Paul has written unto *you*,—as also in *all his* Epistles;"—that is, he distinguishes the Epistle to the Hebrews from the rest, and thus makes his testimony *to it* more significant: and he goes on to vouch for them all as SCRIPTURE, that is, as divinely inspired; and therefore we have a special testimony from the Apostle ST. PETER, that the EPISTLE to the HEBREWS is ST. PAUL'S, and that it is the WORD of GOD.

This testimony is of more importance, when we remember that St. Peter was the Apostle of the Hebrews, and that he had been *openly rebuked* by St. Paul for his temporary weakness in abstaining from eating with the Gentiles at Antioch, through partiality to the Jewish converts. It is worthy of remark, that St. Peter sent his *first* Epistle by *the hand of Silvanus*, or Silas, whom he calls *a faithful brother*,† and who was the Special friend of *St. Paul*,‡ and whom St. Paul *chose*§ as his own companion, in the place of *Marcus, St. Peter's son.* Surely nothing could be more honorable to St. Peter, nothing more charitable, nothing more edifying to Jew and Gentile, than that he, the Apostle of the Hebrews, now about to die together with the Apostle of the Gentiles, for the faith in Christ, should bear witness to *St. Paul's wisdom* in his dealings with the Hebrews; and that St. Peter should show, that, though he had been openly reproved by St. Paul, St. Paul was his *beloved brother;* and

* Euseb. iii. 4. τοῖς ἐξ Ἑβραίων οὖσιν ἐν διασπορᾷ.
† 1 Pet. v. 12.
‡ 2 Cor. i. 19. 1 Thess. i. 1. 2 Thess. i. 1.
§ Acts xv. 39, 40.

that he should set his authoritative Apostolic seal on St. Paul's Epistle to the Hebrews, and recognize it as HOLY SCRIPTURE, and thus declare to Jew and Greek, and to Christians and men in all ages and countries of the world, that there was *no difference* between his own teaching and that of St. Paul,—that he fully adopted what St. Paul had written,—that the Gospel of the Apostle of the Gentiles and of the Apostle of the Circumcision was one and the same Gospel,—that they had both *one Lord, one Faith, one Baptism.*

And as if Christ Himself, in His mercy, was desirous of adding His Own Divine sanction to this testimony of oneness, He was pleased to call these two great Apostles together to Himself by a glorious martyrdom for that one faith, in the same city, and in the same year, and, as is generally believed, upon the same day.*

I will now offer some practical conclusions.

1. Let us admire and bless God's goodness for the assurance He has given us of the Inspiration of this Epistle, which contains so much instruction on the sublimest points of Christian Doctrine, and on the cardinal articles of Christian Duty; and which, though, as St. Peter predicted, it has been wrested by the unlearned and unstable to their own destruction, has ever served, and will ever serve, to refute all the strange and dangerous doctrines of those who deny the Lord who bought them.

2. Let us bless God for the special mode by which we are assured of the genuineness of this Epistle,—I mean the instrumentality of ST. PETER. Let us also thank God for the lessons of wisdom, gentleness, and charity,—especially in dealing with those who may be prejudiced against us—which

* S. Hieron. de S. Paulo, v. "xiv^mo Neronis anno, eodem die quo Petrus, Romæ, pro Christo capite truncatus est, anno post passionem Domini xxxv." Bp. Pearson, Annales Paulini, p. 25.

we are taught by the tone and manner in which this letter was written by St. Paul.

3. We find that the Epistle to the Hebrews was received as Scripture by *St. Peter*, who is claimed by the Church of Rome as the divinely-appointed channel of a pretended infallibility, and that it was imitated by St. Clement, who was Bishop of *Rome* in the first century. Thus we see it was, *originally*, received by the Church of Rome. We find also that it was received in every other part of Christendom, and has never ceased to be so received from the time of the Holy Apostles. But there was a period of time in which, while received in all the Eastern Churches, it *ceased* to be received by the Church of *Rome;* and its reception was *intermitted* in *that* Church during the second, third, and fourth centuries,* and then it began to be again received by the Church of Rome, and has ever since continued to be so.

What are the conclusions from these facts?

We infer,—

1. That the Canonical Authority of the Epistle to the Hebrews was established as soon as it was written; and that, therefore, all the arguments derived from the partial and temporary non-reception of this Epistle to prove the alleged lateness of the Canon, and all the inferences from that allegation, are groundless.

2. That the *Church* of *Rome* has *erred*, with regard to the Canonical Authority of this Epistle. If she is right in receiving it now, as no doubt she is, she *erred in not* receiving it formerly during three centuries.

* The testimony of St. Augustine on this matter is remarkable (De Peccator. Meritis, i. 27): "*Some* (says he) doubt concerning the Epistle to the Hebrews (alluding to the Church of Rome), but I am *more influenced* by the testimony of the *Eastern* Churches which receive it as Canonical."

Evidently then St. Augustine did not regard the authority of Rome as supreme and infallible. S. Jerome, also, we have seen, corrected Rome in this matter by means of the Eastern Church.

3. That the Church of Rome has erred, and does err most perniciously and presumptuously, in affirming that the Church of Christ owes the Canon of Scripture to her; or in the language of one of her Popes,* Gregory the Seventh, that "no Chapter or Book of the Bible is to be regarded as Canonical, without the Pope's authority."

4. That the Church of Rome cannot be trusted for what she delivers by her *own authority*, on the ground of any supposed infallibility derived by her from Christ through St. Peter. For she was not a faithful guardian of the truth taught by St. Peter, and acknowledged by St. Clement, concerning this Epistle of St. Paul, that it is indeed a part of Holy Scripture. And this truth, be it observed, was taught by St. Peter concerning an *Epistle* written from *Italy*, and probably from *Rome* itself.

5. That the Church of Rome, so far from having authorized the Canon of the New Testament, as she alleges, does in fact *owe* her own Canon, as far as this Epistle is concerned, to the testimony of St. Peter faithfully preserved by the Eastern Church, which she denounces as heretical and schismatical; and that, *as far as* the Church of *Rome* was concerned, the Epistle to the Hebrews had lost its canonicity for three centuries, and in all probability would never have recovered it; and that it is therefore a happy thing for the Church of Rome, and for Christendom, that the Church of *Rome* is not *the Catholic* Church.

6. Lastly, We see here, my beloved brethren, by a practical example, what the true grounds of the Canon of the New Testament are. It does not rest, as our Romanist brethren fondly dream, on the testimony of their own present Church; nor on that of any particular Church in the world; for the Church of Rome has erred, by her own showing, in this matter; and any *particular* Church may

* Greg. VII. ap. Card. Baron. Ann. ad A. D. 1076.

likewise err, as our Nineteenth Article teaches. The Light of the Seven candlesticks of the Universal Church will, it is true, never be removed, for, as St. John says, Christ Himself walketh *in the midst of the Candlesticks*;* but any *one* of the candlesticks may burn dimly or be removed, and another candlestick be planted in its room. Our appeal, therefore, concerning the Inspiration of Scripture, as concerning all other matters, is not to any particular Church, but to the Church Universal, and to her Divine Head; it is not to the Present only, but to the Past; not to men, but to CHRIST.

* Rev. i. 13.

ADDITIONAL NOTE, 1851.

Since the above Discourse was delivered and printed, it has been alleged* that the Sixth Article of the Church of England cannot be subscribed "in its literal and grammatical sense," because it declares that "in the name of Holy Scripture we do understand those Canonical Books of the Old and New Testament of whose authority *was never any doubt* in the Church."

For, it is said, if we subscribe this Article in its literal sense, we exclude the Epistle to the Hebrews, and the Second Epistle of St. Peter, and the Epistle of St. James,—of whose authority doubts were entertained by some in the Church in ancient times.†

This objection is urged by one who has fallen away to the Church of Rome, and is one of the reasons adduced for that step.

In order to refute this allegation it is only requisite to read the Sixth Article with attention. The Framers of that Article knew well that doubts were entertained by some in the early Church concerning the authority of certain books in the *New* Testament; and, therefore, having *first* declared that they receive as Holy Scripture those books of whose authority *no doubt* was ever entertained in the Church, they wisely *added* another clause, to provide for the case of such Books as

* Dodsworth's "Anglicanism considered in its Results," pp. 70—72.

† See below, p. 206.

those of whose authority *some doubts* were entertained by some in the Church.

This *additional* clause is as follows:—

"*All* the Books of the *New* Testament as they are commonly received, *we* do receive, and account them Canonical."

It is unquestionable that the Epistle to the Hebrews, and the other Books named with it, *are* "commonly received" in the Church; and therefore it is clear that the Church of England receives them as Canonical. And her Bible,—in which the Canonical Books are separated from the Apocrypha,—sufficiently declares this fact.

And now let me be permitted to observe, that this endeavour to deduce an argument in favour of the Church of Rome from the *Epistle to the Hebrews*, will remind the reflecting reader, that the history of *that* Epistle (as has been shown in the preceding Discourse) displays in a striking manner the feebleness of the foundation on which that Church builds her claims.

LECTURE X.

Jude 17.

"*But, beloved, remember ye the words which were spoken before of* [*i. e. by*] *the Apostles of our Lord Jesus Christ.*"

FROM the Epistle to the Hebrews we pass to the SEVEN CATHOLIC or GENERAL EPISTLES, as they are called, which, in the oldest existing copies of the New Testament, are commonly placed *before* the Epistles of St. Paul, but, in our English Bibles, stand *after* them.

Both in ancient and modern Bibles they are found in the following order: first, the Epistle of St. James, secondly and thirdly, two Epistles of St. Peter; fourthly, fifthly, and sixthly, three Epistles of St. John; seventhly and lastly, the Epistle of St. Jude, from which our text is taken.

It has been commonly supposed* that this order is founded on considerations partly of the time of their composition, and, partly, of the ecclesiastical dignity of those by whom the Epistles were written.

St. Paul, in his Epistle to the Galatians, speaks of "James, Cephas, and John, who seemed to be pillars;"† and in this order their Epistles stand.

* Mill. Prolegomena in N. T. § 236.

† Gal. ii. 9. See Bedæ Prolog. This order may suggest to the reader some reflections concerning the supposed supremacy of St. Peter.

Immediately after the Ascension ST. JAMES was appointed Bishop of Jerusalem. His Epistle is addressed to the Jewish Church, as was the Gospel of St. Matthew. It is well known, that the *lost sheep of the House of Israel** were the first who engaged the care of the Apostles, in accordance with the command and example of Christ; and it is highly probable that, as St. Matthew's was the *first* of the *Gospels*, so the Epistle of St. James was the *first* of the Apostolic *Epistles*.

St. James suffered martyrdom at Jerusalem in the year of our Lord 62, and St. Peter was martyred at Rome in the year 68.

The name† *Catholic*, or Universal, which has been applied to these Seven Epistles since the fourth century, was given them, it is commonly supposed, because, for the most part, they are not addressed to particular Churches, but to all. And it has also been supposed that they were so designated to distinguish them from *heretical* and spurious writings, which began to be disseminated even in the times of the Apostles; and in this sense, *Catholic* Epistles would signify *orthodox* and *canonical*‡ Epistles, Epistles received as such by the Catholic Church.

The case of these Epistles demands special consideration. The Books of the New Testament, which have hitherto engaged our attention,—I mean the Four Gospels, the Acts of the Apostles, and St. Paul's Epistles,—were, as we have seen, received as *divine* Scripture by *all* Christian Churches, as soon as they were written.

But this is not so with *all* the Catholic Epistles. Indeed

* Matth. x. 6; xv. 24.

† Euseb. vi. 14. Concil. Laod. lix. Cyril. Catech. iv. Athanas. Epist. Festal.

‡ They were also sometimes called *Epistolæ Canonicæ* in early times, as by Junilius Afer, by Cassiodorus, and St. Jerome.

only *two* of them, namely, the First of St. Peter, and the First of St. John, were *unanimously* acknowledged as Scripture in the first century.

At that time there were *some* Churches which were acquainted with the other *five*, and yet were in *doubt* as to their divine authority; and even so late as the beginning of the *fourth* century, though these five Epistles were then received as Scripture by the *majority* of Churches,* yet there were *some* Churches which were still in suspense with regard to them; and it was not till the *end* of that century that they were recognized as Divine Writings, wherever they were known.

From these acknowledged facts the following inferences have been drawn.

1. It has been argued by some, that, since these five Epistles were not received by *all* Churches for three centuries after they were written, therefore the Canon of Scripture (by which *we* mean the *divinely inspired written Rule of Christian faith and practice*) was not completed till the end of the fourth century; and therefore that Scripture cannot be the Rule of Faith.

For it cannot be supposed, they say, that the Church was *without* a Rule of Faith three hundred years, and all parts

* Origen. ap. Euseb. vi. 25, says οὐ πάντες receive the 2nd and 3rd of St. John, and that the 2nd of St. Peter ἀμφιβάλλεται; Euseb. iii. 25, says that the Epistles of James and Jude, the 2nd of Peter, and the 2nd and 3rd of John were ἀντιλεγόμεναι, γνώριμαι δ' ὅμως τοῖς πολλοῖς; and again, ἀντιλεγόμεναι, ὅμως δὲ παρὰ πλείστοις τῶν Ἐκκλησιαστικῶν γιγνωσκόμεναι, and he expressly testifies of the Epistles of James and Jude, ἴσμεν καὶ ταύτας μετὰ τῶν λοιπῶν ἐν πλείσταις δεδημοσιευμένας Ἐκκλησίαις. Euseb. ii. 23. St. Athanasius received *all* the Catholic Epistles (Epist. Festal. ii. p. 38), and they are all received by the Councils of Carthage and Laodicea, before the end of the fourth century, and by St. Jerome, ad Paulin. iv. p. 574.

of Scripture were not universally known as Scripture till the end of the fourth century.

2. Further, it is alleged that, since these five Epistles of which we are now speaking, were not universally received as Scripture till the end of the fourth century, and since they *are now* recognized *by all* as inspired, therefore no valid argument against the Inspiration of the *Apocryphal* Books of the *Old* Testament can be raised from the fact that *they* were not received in *the first ages* of Christianity.

For if it could, it is added, we must, by the same reasoning, *reject Five* of the Seven Catholic Epistles.

3. The *fact* also is, that the Church of Rome places these *Five Epistles* in *precisely the same relation* to the *New* Testament as she does the *Apochryphal* Books to the *Old*. She calls these Epistles and Apocrypha by the name of *Deutero-Canonical*, or Books of the *Second Canon; not* meaning thereby that any of them are, in her opinion, in any degree inferior in *value* to those of the first Canon; but thereby affirming with an anathema on all who hold the contrary, that, though they are subsequent in *authorization*, they are not inferior in *authority*.

One of the most celebrated writers of her communion in the present day, a Theological Professor at Rome, thus writes:

"Of the Books of the Old and New Testament, some are called *Proto-canonical*, others *Deutero-canonical*. The *Proto-canonical*, or those which were *first* received into the Canon; the *Deutero-canonical* are those which were *afterwards* admitted into it.

"The *Proto-canonical* Books of the *Old* Testament are those which were received by the Jews. The *Deutero-canonical*, or those of the *Second* Canon, are *Baruch*, *Tobit*, *Judith*, *Wisdom*, *Ecclesiasticus*, and *the two Books of the Maccabees*, which were *afterwards* received into the Canon of the Church" (the writer means the Canon of the Church

of *Rome*, which so received them at the Council of Trent, in the middle of the sixteenth century.)

"The *Proto-canonical Books*," (he adds) "of the *New* Testament are, the Four Gospels, the Acts of the Apostles, thirteen Epistles of St. Paul, one of St. Peter, one of St. John.

"Those of the *Second* Canon are, the Epistle of St. Paul to the *Hebrews*, the *Second Epistle of St. Peter*, the *Second and Third of St. John*, that of *St. James*, and *St. Jude*, and the *Apocalypse*.

"Both these classes of Books, the *Proto* and the *Deutero-canonical*," he says, "have the same authority in the Catholic Church" (the writer means the Church of *Rome*), "which acknowledges *no distinction between them*."*

According to these allegations, it would follow that belief in the inspiration of Scripture must resolve itself in the end into belief in the inspiration of the Church of Rome.

No regard would be paid, or would be due, to the qualifications of the *authors* of the Books in question, or to the *contents* of those Books, or to the testimony of the primitive Church of Christ concerning them, or to that, either of the Apostles, or even of CHRIST Himself.

You see then how important it is that the true character and position of these five Catholic Epistles† should be carefully examined and clearly understood.

To speak first of the EPISTLE OF ST. JAMES.

This Epistle, which stands first in order, and has always so stood,‡ appears, as I have said, to have been written first in time.

St. James, as we are informed by a Disciple§ of St. John,

* Perrone, de Locis Theologicis, p. 1048. ed. 1842.

† *i. e.* 2 Peter, 2 and 3 John, James, Jude.

‡ Euseb. ii. 23. ἡ πρώτη τῶν ὀνομαζομένων καθολικῶν.

§ Papias. See Routh, Reliquiæ, i. pp. 3, 16, 198, 203. Compare Dr. Mill's Dissertation on the "Brethren of our Lord," in which the

was the son of Cleopas or Alphæus and of Mary, the sister of the Blessed Virgin. This Mary was one of the women who stood before the cross at the Crucifixion and carried spices to the tomb of our Lord, and was one of the first to whom He showed Himself alive after His Resurrection; and Cleopas, the father of St. James, was one of two Disciples who walked with Him to Emmaus. St. James, then, was our Lord's Cousin according to the flesh, and, in the Jewish manner of speaking, is termed in Scripture *the Lord's brother.** He was one of the Twelve, and, as St. Paul informs us, was honored by our Lord with a special manifestation after the Resurrection.

After the Ascension of Christ, he was appointed by the Apostles Bishop of Jerusalem, where he remained for about thirty years—till his death. His position there was one of great difficulty, and called for the constant exercise of those supernatural gifts, with which he was endued. After the Crucifixion, that ill-fated City was the scene of the worst crimes. It was torn with intestine factions, defiled with riot, profaned by blasphemy, maddened by fanaticism, and deluged with blood. Here St. James dwelt—like Lot in Sodom.

Let us remember, also, that it was a task demanding divine wisdom so to preach the Gospel as not to disparage the Law, and so to build up the Church as not to undermine the Temple; and to show to Priests and Scribes that it was the greatest glory of Moses, whom they read, but did not understand, to have been a faithful witness of Christ, whom they *with wicked hands had crucified and slain.* Yet, though he was beset with these difficulties, such was the

learned Author assents to the opinion that Cleopas and Alphæus are two forms of the same name, which was the opinion of St. Jerome, and is also adopted in Guerike's Einleitung, p. 490.

* Gal. i. 19. Cp. Matth. xii. 46; xiii. 55. Mark vi. 3. John ii. 12. 1 Cor. ix. 5.

courage and gentleness of St. James, that he commanded the respect not only of Christians but of Jews, and was called JAMES the JUST.

His Epistle is addressed to the Twelve Tribes, to Jewish Christians and to unconverted Jews.

Let us pause here to remark, as a providential circumstance, that the Temple and City of Jerusalem were not destroyed *immediately* after the Crucifixion. It would have been very difficult for Christian teachers to preach the Gospel to the twelve tribes of *the dispersion*, if these Christian teachers had been obliged to go in quest of these scattered tribes. But, happily these tribes *came up to Jerusalem* at the three great yearly Festivals.

Thus these great Jewish Festivals became occasions and means for the diffusion of the Gospel of Christ.

This fact is clearly brought out in the history of the first Day of Pentecost after the Passover at which our Lord suffered. The events of that day—the Descent of the Holy Spirit, the Gift of Tongues, the miracles wrought by the Apostles, their preaching in the name of Jesus, newly risen from the dead—were, doubtless, immediately conveyed by the ebbing streams of the homeward-going Tribes into all the regions of the earth.

It cannot be doubted that the Epistle of St. James, addressed to the twelve Tribes, was diffused in this manner.

Thus, the dispersion of the Jews, and their connection with Jerusalem as a centre of religion, was, in the hands of Divine Providence, one of the most effective means for propagating Christianity. The pilgrim-troops of the Law became Caravans for the Gospel.

But to return to St. James. He exclaims to the Jews: "Ye have condemned and killed the Just One (that is, Jesus Christ), and He doth not resist you." Further; to the Christians he commends patience, humility, prayer. He writes as a Bishop both to the Clergy and Laity of the

Church, and gives warnings and directions concerning their respective duties. He remonstrates on the coldness of their devotion, especially in prayer. On the luxury and pride of the wealthy, and the servile adulation of riches, even in Church assemblies, on the prevalence of a mere dry and fruitless profession of faith,* on the reckless and profane use of oaths in familiar conversation. To the Jews, again, he addresses tremendous warnings, called for by their sins, above all, by the rejection and crucifixion of Christ, which was soon to be avenged by God's fierce wrath and retribution; "Cleanse your hands, ye sinners, and purify your hearts." Soon was their own curse to fall upon their heads; "His blood be upon us and upon our children!" To them St. James says: "Be afflicted and mourn, and weep. Go to now, ye rich men, weep and howl for your miseries that shall come upon you." And then the Apostle turns to the Christians and says: "Be patient, brethren, until the coming of the Lord; Be ye patient, stablish your hearts; for the coming of the Lord draweth nigh. Grudge not one against another, brethren, lest ye be condemned: Behold, the JUDGE standeth before the DOOR."

Such is the language of ST. JAMES—the Christian Jeremiah.

Is this Epistle inspired?

Consider first the Author. *The Lord's Brother;* called by Him to be an Apostle, and breathed upon by Him; filled with the Holy Ghost; chosen by the Apostles to preside

* James i. 22—27; ii. 14—26. The so-called faith against which *St. James* raised his voice, was that of those who imagined that if they were distinguished from the heathen by acknowledging the One True God, they were sure of acceptance from Him, whatever their lives might be, οὓς λέγουσι (says Justin Martyr, Dialog. p. 370,) ὅτι, πᾶν ἁμαρτωλοὶ ὦσι, θεὸν δὲ γινώσκωσιν, οὐ μὴ λογίσηται αὐτοῖς Κύριος ἁμαρτίαν. See Guerike, p. 494. *St. Paul's* expostulations were specially addressed to those Jews who maintained that the observance of the whole Law of Moses was the cause of Justification.

over the Mother Church of Christendom; framing a decree, at the Council of Jerusalem, which contained the solemn words: *It hath seemed good to the* HOLY GHOST *and to us;* treated with special deference by St. Peter and St. Paul, and by all the Apostles; reverenced for his holiness by Christians and Jews; and sealing with his blood as a Martyr the faith which he preached as an Apostle.

Surely an Epistle, which came from such a man as this, might well claim to be inspired.*

But, how, then, it may be asked, is it to be explained that this Epistle was *not* received as inspired in *all* Churches in the first and second centuries?

Doubts, it is true, we reply, *were* entertained at that time in *some* quarters concerning its Inspiration. But, first of all, be it observed, it is one thing for the authority of a book to be *doubted*, and another thing for it to be *rejected*. *No doubt* was entertained any where in the first century concerning the Apocryphal Books of the *Old* Testament; they were *known* to be *not* inspired. But, concerning the Epistle† of St. James, and the other four Catholic Epistles, which have been before mentioned, *doubts were* entertained by *some;* and the very fact of the doubt proves that they who doubted might have their doubts cleared up, and receive these books as inspired.

And, next, we know, that these doubts *were* cleared up. *All* these five Epistles *were* received *in course of time* by all who had once doubted concerning them.

Next, it is to be remembered, that though *some* doubted,

* It is well shown by Whitby (on James v.), from Josephus, how accurately the *predictions* of St. James concerning Jerusalem were *fulfilled;* and this is a strong *proof* of *inspiration.*

† The reason why the Epistle of St. James was not universally received from the first appears to have been, that some imagined it to be at variance with the teaching of St. Paul. This was Luther's ground. See above, p. 15, and the passages quoted from Luther in Guerike's Einleitung, p. 499. Others reasons are mentioned below.

others did *not* doubt, but received all these Five Epistles *from the beginning;* and the very doubts of those who *did* doubt are presumptive proofs that they who did *not* doubt had good reason for not doubting, and that they acted rightly in *receiving* these Epistles from the very first.

Be it remembered, also, that the question at issue was not concerning a light matter, but respecting one of unspeakable importance. It was not concerning the genuineness of a Poem, or the authenticity of a History. No. It was nothing short of this,—Is this Writing from Man, or from God?

Therefore, Christians were *bound* to pause till they had conclusive evidence whereon to decide; lest, haply, they should ascribe what was divine to man, or impute what was human to God.

Let us, also, observe, that, in those early times, innumerable* writings *bearing* the *names* of Apostles and Evangelists, were disseminated by *heretics*. Spurious and heterodox compositions were diffused under the name of the Authors of these very Five Catholic Epistles. We read of forgeries then current, such as the following: "The Book of James," "The Gospel of Peter," "The Preaching and Revelation of Peter," "The Acts of John," "The Gospel of Jude."†

Therefore, in their genuine writings, the Apostles charged the primitive Churches to be upon their guard against suppositious Books. "Be not shaken," says St. Paul, "by word or by letter as from us as that the day of Christ is at hand." "Beloved," says St. John, "believe not every spirit, but try the spirits whether they are of God; because many false Prophets are gone out into the world."

The primitive Churches, therefore, were *obliged* to exercise a sage caution. It was their *duty* to *doubt*. They

* Called by Irenæus, i. 18. ἀμύθητον πλῆθος ἀποκρύφων καὶ νόθων γραφῶν.

† See the copious list given by Jones on the Canon, pp. 28–31.

would have been very culpable, if they had not *suspended* their judgment concerning the authority of Epistles, brought to them with the name of Apostles of Christ, till the Inspiration of such books was avouched to them by indisputable evidence. They were under a most solemn obligation to wait, till such evidence could be procured, and not to receive books even of the highest intrinsic value on insufficient grounds. It was certain, that, *if* these books were really inspired, authentic proof of their inspiration would be given in course of time; whereas, if any uninspired book were once received as Scripture, then, it was very *probable* that false doctrine would come in with it; and it was *certain*, that the confidence of the people in the authority of the books which *were* really *inspired*, and had been received as such, would be shaken, and so the foundations of Christianity would be undermined.

While, therefore, we see good reason in the circumstances of the case, why some should have doubted concerning the Inspiration of these Epistles, we derive a firm assurance from these same circumstances, that those Churches which did *not* doubt concerning their Inspiration, but received them as Scripture from the first, acted rightly in doing so.

I have spoken of the demurs of some Churches concerning these Epistles; and of the wise caution exercised by the Church generally in the reception of Books into the Canon of Scripture. And let me now add, that we owe it to this wise caution, or rather, we would say, to the HOLY SPIRIT suggesting it, that no Book, which has been *once* received by the Christian Church, has ever been proved to have been received without adequate reason. Thus, our trust in the judgment of the Church, as a whole, is strengthened by our knowledge of the discreet and circumspect manner in which that judgment was exercised.

It is very satisfactory to know that no book was admitted into the Canon of Scripture, before its credentials were

rigidly examined, and that *every* book which we receive as Scripture has passed through a most searching and scrutinizing ordeal. And our belief in the Inspiration of all the Books of Scripture now universally received, is thus confirmed by the *doubts* which *deferred* the reception of *some small* portions of Scripture in *certain parts* of the Church.

It must also be remembered, with respect to these five Catholic Epistles, that there were points in them (and we know what those points were*) which might and did in the first instance suggest doubt; but which, when afterwards examined, did dispel doubt and rivet conviction.

For instance, St. James in the commencement of his Epistle does not call himself an *Apostle*, nor *the Lord's Brother*, but a *Servant* of Jesus Christ. The same is the case with St. Jude. Till the reason of this was explained, it might be doubted whether these Epistles *were* really written by *Apostles* and *Brethren of the Lord*.* Just as it was doubted by some whether the Epistle to the Hebrews was written by St. Paul, because it had not his name prefixed to it.

Again, St. Jude in his Epistle refers to the contention of Michael the Archangel with the Devil, for the body of Moses, of which we read nothing in the Old Testament; and St. Jude, also, was thought to refer to an Apocryphal Book, the Book of Enoch. Hence† demurs arose concerning this Epistle. But, when these matters were cleared up, then, what had caused a scruple was an occasion of greater assurance.‡

* See above, p. 212, and note in the next page.

† Jude 14. See St. Jerome, Catal. Script. iv. "Quia de libro Enoch, qui apocryphus est, assumit testimonium;" but (adds St. Jerome), "auctoritatem vetustate jam et usu meruit et inter Sanctas *Scripturas* computatur."

‡ 1 Cor. ix. 5. Gal. i. 19. For it is evident that a person *counterfeiting* an Apostle would have called himself an Apostle, and have endeavoured to *imitate* his style, and would have abstained from using suspicious writings. Eusebius well remarks (Dem. Evang. iii. 5.)

So again, the *style* of the *Second* Epistle of St. Peter* is differen from that of the *first;* and in the second and third Epistles of St. John, the author calls himself a *Presbyter*† or Elder, and *not* an *Apostle.* These points excited surmise. Time was required to explain them; the judgment of *certain* Churches was held for a while in suspense; but, finally, and without exception the suffrages of *all* inclined in their favour. They were all received, by all Churches, in all places; and so all doubts concerning them were at an end.

Let us return to the Epistle of St. James. Was it received as Scripture in some parts of the Church, as soon as it was written?

1. Abundant evidence might be adduced to show that it was generally known and received in Jerusalem, and by the Twelve Tribes of the dispersion, to whom it was addressed.

In proof of this, I would observe, that St. James was martyred at Jerusalem, at the Passover of the‡ year 62;

that it was quite in character with St. John's humility to call himself ὁ πρεσβύτερος. See also the remark of St. Dionysius ap. Euseb. vii. 25. The same may be said of St. James and St. Jude, calling themselves not Apostles nor "Brethren of the Lord," but simply δοῦλοι Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ. See Clem. Alex. Adumbratio in Ep. Judæ, p. 1007, ed. Oxon. "Judas, extans valdè *religiosus*, non dixit seipsum *fratrem* Domini. Sed quid dixit? Judas *servus* J. C., *frater* autem Jacobi."

* Jerome, Catal. Scrip. i. St. Jerome, in his Epist. 120, c. ii. says, "The two Epistles of St. Peter differ in style; whence we perceive, that according to the exigency of circumstances, he used different interpreters." Whatever may be thought of this solution, it shows the difficulty and explains the delay in the reception of the Epistle in certain churches. Besides, the text 2 Pet. ii. 20, was abused by the Montanists and Novatians, in the same way as Heb. vi. 1—7, and thus the reception of the Epistle in some places was delayed for a time.

† See note ‡, preceding page.

‡ See Bp. Pearson, Annales Paulini, p. 19. Bede says that St. James suffered the 30th year, St. Peter the 38th, (St. Jerome says the 37th,) and St. Jerome says that St. John died the 68th year after our Lord's passion.

and the circumstances of his martyrdom are narrated as follows, by a person who lived in the age next to the Apostles, the Church Historian Hegesippus.*

After describing the sanctity of St. James's life, the writer thus speaks. "The religious sects, then prevalent at Jerusalem, were wont to address this question to St. James, 'Which is the *Door* of Jesus?' These sects," adds the writer, "did not believe in the Resurrection, nor that Christ would come to reward every one according to his works. But when many Jews of high station were converted by St. James, an uproar was made by the Scribes and Pharisees, exclaiming, that all the people was expecting the coming of Jesus as the Christ. They, therefore, came to St. James, and said, 'We entreat thee, restrain the people, for they are all gone mad after Jesus, as if he were the Christ. We implore thee, therefore, to instruct all, who have come up to the Passover, concerning the truth. For we all venerate thee; we all bear testimony to thee, that thou art Just, and no respecter of persons. Stand, therefore, on a lofty place of the Temple, that thou mayst be seen and heard by all; for all the Tribes with the Gentiles have come up to the Passover.' . . . . They placed him, therefore, on a pinnacle of the Temple, and cried aloud, 'O thou Just man, whom we all ought to believe, tell us, since the People is going out after that Jesus who has been crucified, tell us, which is the *Door of Jesus?*'

"Such was their question. To which St. James replied with a loud voice, 'Why ask ye me concerning Jesus the Son of Man? He sitteth in heaven on the Right Hand of power, and will come again on the clouds of heaven.' . . Upon this many of the people exclaimed, 'Hosanna to the Son of David!' But St. James was cast down headlong by the Scribes and Pharisees; and falling upon his knees and

* Ap. Euseb. ii. 23. Comp. Dem. Ev. iii. 5.

praying, *Father, forgive them, for they know not what they do*, he was stoned and beaten to death."

Such is the narrative of Hegesippus concerning the martyrdom of St. James.

Much perplexity has been occasioned by the words which occur twice in this history, "Which is *the Door of Jesus?*" As they appear to bear upon our present subject, and as no satisfactory explanation,* as far as I am aware, has as yet been offered of them, perhaps the following endeavour to account for them may be viewed with more indulgence.

The Jews, we know from the Acts of the Apostles, were exasperated at the rescue of St. Paul from their hands; and we learn† from early Church history, that they therefore determined to wreak vengeance upon St. James. It has been justly observed,‡ that the publication of St. James's Epistle, addressed to the Jews at Jerusalem, as well as to the Tribes of the dispersion and to the Jewish converts,—to whom doubtless copies were carried by those who came up to the periodical Jewish feasts, and so the Epistle was dispersed throughout the world,—was very obnoxious to some of the Jews, especially to the higher classes, because it announced the Woes that would soon fall upon them and upon their Country.

The Tribes, to whom it was addressed, came up to the Passover; and the Rulers hoped, by means of flattery or menace, to obtain from St. James some recantation of what he had written. It appears from the narrative we have quoted, that the expression, "*Which is the Door of Jesus?*" was a question addressed to the Apostle in a tone of sarcasm and derision. "The people is gone wild after Jesus: they expect that He will immediately appear. Which, then,

* The various opinions may be seen in the Variorum Notes to Eusebius, ii. 23; and in Lardner's Life of St. James, ch. xvi.

† Euseb. ii. 23.

‡ By Lardner. See also Macknight, Preface to St. James, sect. iii.

is the *way?* What the *road* by which He will come? Which the *Door* by which He will enter?"

Such seems to be the meaning of the question.

And further: it contains, I believe, a reference to a striking passage in St. James the Just's own Epistle,—"The coming of the Lord draweth nigh, behold the JUDGE *standeth before the* DOOR."*

To this question St. James replied, "He will come on the clouds of Heaven;" Jesus, the King of glory, has entered the Doors of Heaven; through the everlasting Doors† of Heaven He will come to judge the World.

If this supposition be true, then it would appear probable from this reference to the Epistle, that it was generally known at Jerusalem, and to the Twelve Tribes of the Dispersion, and to the Churches‡ of Palestine.

2. Let me observe, also, that this Epistle is contained in the Pschito or early primitive version of the Syrian Church, in the second century, and this Church from its neighbourhood to Palestine, where the Epistle was written, had the best means of ascertaining its authority. It was received also by the Roman Church§ in the second century, and is frequently quoted by St. Clement,‖ Bishop of Rome, the

* James v. 8, 9. Compare Matt. xxiv. 33. "It is near, even at the Door." In the words also, "Thou art no respecter of persons," there may, perhaps, be a reference to James ii. 1. 9. The words in his Epistle ἐφονεύσατε τὸν Δίκαιον, οὐκ ἀντιτάσσεται ὑμῖν (v. 6.); and πολὺ ἰσχύει δέησις Δικαίου ἐνεργουμένη (v. 16.), have a special interest considered in connection with the dying prayer and martyrdom of "the Just" Apostle of THE JUST.

† Ps. xxiv. 7—9.

‡ The words in St. James, Ep. ii. 2, prove the existence of public religious assemblies among those to whom he wrote; and an Epistle from a Bishop of Jerusalem would be read in them.

§ It is cited by Tertullian de Orat. c. 8. adv. Jud. 2; by Origen it is cited as the Epistle of James in John iv. p. 306. Homil. 13 in Genes. and passim.

‖ Capp. x. xxiii. xxxviii.

fellow-labourer of St. Paul. And further: St. Jude, in his Epistle, introduces himself as the *brother of James;* by which he seems to intimate that James was well known to those whom he himself addresses. This was probably the case by means of an Epistle; for James, as far as we know, never left Jerusalem. Besides, some early* interpreters affirm that St. Paul himself refers to St. James, when he says, in the Epistle to the Hebrews, "Remember your spiritual guides, who have spoken unto you the Word of the Lord, whose faith follow, considering the end of their conversation;"† that is, meditating on the close of their labours.

Here it has been thought with much reason, St. Paul refers the Hebrews to the glorious martyrdom of the Bishop of Jerusalem, and to the Word of the Lord spoken by him in his Epistle.

3. Further; There are more than ten different passages of a moral and doctrinal character in St. Peter's *First* Epistle (an Epistle, be it remembered, universally received as inspired, from the first, and written after‡ that of St. James,) which coincide literally more or less with passages in the Epistle of St. James.§ Thus St. Peter, or rather the

* Theodoret ad loc.

† Heb. xiii. 7.

‡ For it was written only a short time before St. Peter's own death, (see below, p. 223, which took place A. D. 68. And St. James was martyred A. D. 62. Bede says very rightly, "Petrus imminente passione secundum scripsit Epistolam cum multo antè Jacobus misgraverat ad Christum."

§ Compare

James i. 1.	= 1 Pet. i. 1.
James i. 2.	= 1 Pet. i. 6.
	= 1 Pet. iv. 12.
James i. 11.	= 1 Pet. i. 24.
James i. 18.	= 1 Pet. i. 3.
	= 1 Pet. i. 23.
James ii. 7.	= 1 Pet. iv. 14.
James iii. 13.	= 1 Pet. ii. 12.
James iv. 1.	= 1 Pet. ii. 11.

HOLY SPIRIT speaking by St. Peter, bears a strong, though silent, witness to the Inspiration of this Epistle. He could not give a clearer testimony to it, than by *adopting* parts of it and incorporating it in an inspired Epistle.

We therefore arrive at the conclusion, first, that the sacred functions, divine endowments, and saintly life and death of St. James, the Lord's Brother, the First Bishop of Jerusalem, render it probable, *à priori*, that an Epistle, addressed by him to the converted and unconverted Jews *is divinely inspired;* and that, secondly, in fact, the Epistle of St. JAMES *was* received as Scripture in the age of the writer, by persons whose verdict is conclusive concerning its Inspiration; and we add, that the Epistle itself, especially when considered with respect to the circumstances under which it was written, confirms this belief.

4. Let me add, lastly,—and this remark, be it observed, applies to all the Five Epistles,—that the subsequent suffrage of the *whole* Church in favour of these Epistles proves that those particular Churches *judged aright*, who received these Epistles *from the beginning*.

Christ never promised Omniscience or Infallibility to any *one* part of His Church. But He *did* promise to be *alway with His Church*, and to *guide her into all truth;* and this promise would not have been fulfilled, if the whole Church were now in error concerning the Inspiration of these Epistles, or if, these Epistles being inspired, their Inspiration had not been known to any portion of the Church in the age in which they were written.

But we must pause here for the present, and reserve to another occasion what remains to be said on the other Catholic Epistles.

James iv. 6. = 1 Pet. v. 5, 6.
James iv. 7. = 1 Pet. v. 9.
James iv. 10. = 1 Pet. v. 6.
James v. 20. = 1 Pet. iv. 8.

LECTURE XI.

Jude 17.

"Beloved, remember ye the words which were spoken before of the Apostles of our Lord Jesus Christ."

We pass now to the Second Epistle of St. Peter.

Its *genuineness* being admitted, of which proof has been given on a former occasion,* and which was acknowledged by ancient writers of credit, no one, I think, can doubt† its Inspiration.

Its author is St. Peter; St. Peter about to die for Christ, and delivering a farewell charge to the Church. "I know that shortly I must put off this my tabernacle, even as our Lord Jesus Christ hath showed me; moreover, I will endeavour that ye may be able after my decease to have these things always in remembrance."‡ He, therefore, anticipates that this, his last letter, will be generally received, and read.

This expectation has been fulfilled. He also utters a prophecy. "There shall be false teachers among you," he

* Lect. VII. p. 158. Origen. Hom. vi. in Josuam says, "Petrus *duabus* Epistolarum personat tubis;" and in Hom. iv. in Levit. he quotes from the *Second* Epistle (2 Pet. i. 4) as Peter's.

† I have not, therefore, thought it worth while to dwell on its reception by Justin Martyr, c. Trypho, p. 308. See Mede's Works, p. 611. Irenæus, v. 23; v. 28.

‡ 2 Pet. i. 14, 15.

says, "who shall privily bring in damnable heresies, even denying the Lord that bought them." This, also, has been fulfilled. And prophecy is a work, and a *fulfilled* prophecy is a *proof*, of Inspiration.

Again, he couples the Second Epistle with the First, and puts it on a *par* with *it;* and the First Epistle has ever been received as Inspired. This Second Epistle, (he says,) in the first verse of the third chapter, I write to you, already,* that is, sooner perhaps than you may have expected after the first, in both which Epistles I now stir up your pure minds by way of remembrance. The Author, therefore, presents the Epistle as inspired. And, surely, if there ever was a time in the life of the Blessed Apostle, to whom Jesus Christ gave "many excellent gifts, and commanded him earnestly to feed His flock;" if there ever was a period of his ministry in which a double effusion of divine grace might have been expected by him, both for his own sake and for that of the Church of Christ, it was when he was uttering his last words, and was girding up his loins to follow Christ, by dying on the cross.

St. Jude's own Epistle, which appears to have been written after the death of all the Apostles except St. John, was received both in the Eastern and the Western Church in the second and third centuries.†

Again. If the genuineness of this Epistle be established, there cannot, I apprehend, be any doubt of its Inspiration. And its genuineness may, I think, be proved as follows.

* ἤδη γράφω: whence it appears that the First Epistle also was written only a short time before his death, which took place A. D. 68.

† Tertullian. de Cultu Fœm. l. 3. Canon Muratorianus; Epistola sanè Judæ in Catholica habetur. Clemens Alex. Pæd. ii. p. 239. iii. p. 431. Adumbratio in Ep. Jud. p. 1007. Origen (Huet. i. p. 223) calls it "an Epistle of few lines, but full of powerful words of divine grace." He cites it frequently as Jude the Apostle's.

The Author of the Epistle describes himself as "Jude, the servant of Jesus Christ, and brother of James." St. Jude, we know, died before St. John, that is, before the beginning of the second century. Now, we learn from early Church History,* that St. James was succeeded in the Bishopric of Jerusalem by Symeon his brother; and also, that Symeon sate in that see till the year of our Lord 107, when he suffered martyrdom by crucifixion, in the 120th year of his age.

We find that the Epistle of St. Jude was known in the East and the West in the second century; it therefore appears to have been circulated in Symeon's lifetime; indeed, an Epistle, bearing the Apostle's name, and *first* appearing after the beginning of the *second* century, would never have received any currency, such as the Epistle of St. Jude has received; and Symeon would never have *permitted* a letter bearing the name of an Apostle, his own brother, Jude, brother of his own Apostolical predecessor, St. James, to have been circulated, if it had not been really written by St. Jude. The Epistle, therefore, of St. Jude is genuine; it is the work of an Apostle.†

But this is not all. The Apostle St. Peter has authenticated St. Jude's Epistle by adopting much of it into his own.

St. Jude's Epistle consists of only twenty-five verses, and it is very remarkable that in these there are twelve passages which St. Peter has incorporated in his own Second Epistle.‡

* Euseb. iii. 32.

† It is cited as such by S. Hippolytus in the third century, de Antichristo. B. P. M. iii. p. 254, E.

‡ Jude 2. = 2 Pet. i. 2.
Jude 4. = 2 Pet. ii. 1.
Jude 6. = 2 Pet. ii. 4.
Jude 7. = 2 Pet. ii. 6.
Jude 8. = 2 Pet. ii. 10.
Jude 9. = 2 Pet. ii. 11.

St. Peter quotes St. Jude's Epistle as already known and received, as an Apostolic Epistle, by those whom he, St. Peter, addresses. Thus, he says, "Remember the commandment of us the Apostles . . . Knowing this first, that there shall come in the last days scoffers, walking after their own lusts."* This is verbatim from St. Jude's Epistle. "Beloved, remember the words spoken before by the Apostles of our Lord Jesus Christ, how they told you that there should be scoffers in the last time walking after their own ungodly lusts."

Thus St. Peter bears witness to the Inspiration of St. Jude's Epistle, by appealing to it as having Apostolic authority and prophetical veracity, and by adopting its words, and by referring to it as received by the Churches to which he, St. Peter, wrote. Thus St. Peter canonizes the Epistle of St. Jude.

Of the two short Epistles ascribed to ST. JOHN, I would observe, that, whatever is of a doctrinal character in them is contained in his longer Epistle, which has ever been received as inspired. If they were written *before* that Epistle, then he has authorized them by *adopting* their teaching and language; if *after*, then he has given a no less weighty sanction by *anticipating* it. They certainly were not written by any false teacher, for they contain only true doctrine,—the doctrine of St. John; and whoever committed them to

Jude 10. = 2 Pet. ii. 12.
Jude 11. = 2 Pet. ii. 15.
Jude 12. = 2 Pet. ii. 17.
Jude 16. = 2 Pet. ii. 18.
Jude 18. = 2 Pet. ii. 1.
Jude 18. = 2 Pet. iii. 3.

* 2 Pet. iii. 3. Concerning the pernicious doctrines and licentious practices of these false Teachers and their followers, see particularly Hammond's Dissertationes, Diss. I. capp. iii—viii. tom. iv. p. 725, ed. 1684.

paper, (and all testimony* is in favor of their genuineness,) their essence is his; and so in substance they are inspired.

Let me here desire your attention to a remarkable connection between the *First* Epistle of St. Peter and the *Second* of St. John.

The First Epistle of St. Peter, as appears from its commencement, is addressed to the "*Elect*, scattered throughout Pontus,† Galatia, Cappadocia, Asia, and Bithynia;" that is, to the Jews dispersed in *Asia* Minor; and at its close we read, "The Church that is at *Babylon*, *elected* together with you, saluteth you, and so doth *Marcus* my son."

The Second Epistle of St. John begins thus: "The Elder to the *Elect* Lady and her children whom I love in the truth:" and it ends with the words, "The Children of thine *Elect* Sister greet thee."

You are aware that it has been doubted *what* place the *Babylon* was, from which St. Peter wrote; and also whether the *Elect Lady*, to whom St. John wrote, was a Person or a Church.

If I may venture to offer an opinion on these controverted points, it seems to me that both these questions may be deter-

* See Origen's testimony and that of Dionysius, Bishop of Alexandria, in the third century, ap. Euseb. vii. 25. οὐδὲ ἐν τῇ δευτέρᾳ φερομένῃ Ἰωάννου καὶ τρίτῃ, καίτοι βραχείαις οὔσαις ἐπιστολαῖς ὁ Ἰωάννης ὀνομαστὶ πρόκειται ἀλλὰ ἀνωνύμως ὁ πρεσβύτερος γέγραπται. Irenæus, whose testimony—on account of his connection with St. Polycarp, the disciple of St. John—is of the greatest weight, unhesitatingly ascribes the Second Epistle to St. John (Adv. Hær. i. 16. § 3; and again, iii. 16. § 8): and if the Second is his, so is the Third; for the word ὁ πρεσβύτερος identifies the author of the one with that of the other. The Roman Canon, also, of the second century says, "Johannis *duæ* in Catholica habentur."

† Hence this Epistle of St. Peter is sometimes inscribed "Ad Ponticos;" see Tertullian. cont. Gnost. c. 12.

mined at once; and that, by the solution of them, we gain an important result with respect to the Canon of the New Testament.

In some ancient Latin manuscripts, St. John's *first* Epistle is inscribed *Ad Parthos*,*—to the Parthians—and as is probable from earlier authorities, as well as from internal evidence, this inscription belongs to St. John's *Second* Epistle, *as well as* the First.† For the *Latin Translator* of a work of Clement of Alexandria‡ (the Greek original of which is not now extant) says, "*Secunda* Johannis Epistola, quæ ad *Virgines* inscripta est, simplicissima est." It has been well conjectured that St. Clement wrote πρὸς Πάρθους, (*ad Parthos*) which was corrupted into πρὸς Παρθένους, whence the *Latin Translator* wrote "*ad Virgines;*" and this is almost certain, from the fact that none of St. John's Epistles is addressed to Virgins; and St. Clement himself says that this Second Epistle was written to a certain *Babylonian*, and that the word Electa, the Elect Lady, intimates the *Election* of a *Church*. St. Jerome gives the same meaning of the word Electa;§ he applies it to a Church; and this is still further confirmed by the word Κυρία, or *Lady*, which is very appropriate to a Church (Κυριακή) as connected with Κύριος, the LORD.

But what is to be said of the word *Babylonia*, to whom, Clement affirms, St. John wrote an Epistle? and how is it to be connected with the inscription "*Ad Parthos*,"—to the Parthians?

I would suggest the following reply:

St. Peter was the Apostle of the Jews, and he was the beloved fellow Apostle of St. John; he addresses his First

* See note below, p. 230; and Lardner, ii. 587. iii. 428.

† It is remarkable that S. Irenæus, iii. 16. § 8 quotes from the *Second* Epistle as one and the same with the *First*.

‡ Adumbrat. p. 1011. St. Clement flourished A. D. 192.

§ See Hammond on 1 Pet. v. 13. 2 John ii. 1.

Epistle to the Jews of the Asiatic dispersion;* that is, to those of St. John's peculiar province; and he closes his Epistle with the salutation, "Your *co-elect* Sister Church at *Babylon* saluteth you, and so doth *Marcus* my son." And St. John, the brother Apostle of St. Peter, *elect* together with him,—St. John, specially beloved by Christ, as Christ was specially beloved by St. Peter,—St. John, the Metropolitan† of the *Elect* of Asia, whom St. Peter had addressed, writes to the *Elect* Lady and her children, *whom he loves in truth;* and he closes his Epistle with the salutation, "The children of thine Elect Sister greet thee."

"*The Elect Lady*," I believe was the Church‡ of *Babylon*, and her "*Elect Sister*," the Asiatic Church.

Hence, St. Clement says that St. John writes to a *Babylonian Electa*, signifying an *Elect Church;* and also, according to the conjecture already mentioned, to the *Parthians*, of whose empire, as it *then* existed, *Babylon*, it must be remembered, was the most celebrated city, as far as the *Jews* and their history are concerned. Hence, Milton§ thus speaks,

> "There *Babylon*, the wonder of all tongues.
> . . . . . .
> All these the *Parthian* holds."

Babylon was the city *to* which the *Two* tribes were carried away captive, and *from* which those of the *Asiatic* dispersion, to whom St. Peter writes, were derived; and we know, from Philo and Josephus,|| that Babylon contained a great many Jews in the Apostolic age.

* 1 Pet. i. 2.

† See the authorities collected by Archbishop Ussher, "Original of Metropolitans," pp. 95—95. Oxf. 1641.

‡ An ancient Scholium in one of Matthäi's MSS. p. 152, says, ἐκλεκτὴν κυρίαν λέγει τὴν ἐν τινὶ τόπῳ Ἐκκλησίαν.

§ Par. Reg. Book iii. ver. 280.

|| Philo Legat. ad Caium, § 36. Josephus, Antiq. xv. 2, 4; xviii. 12; xxiii. 12. Major Rennell, Geogr. of Herod. Sect. xv. p. 533, "So

In fact, the Second (and, perhaps, also the First) Epistle of St. John, who is said to have preached the Gospel in Parthia,* appears to have been written to the *elect* Church of the *Parthian* Assyria, of which Babylon was the head; and to be of the nature of a *reply* to St. Peter's First Epistle "to the *Elect* of *Asia*," written from the same *Babylon*, and bearing the salutation of the *co-elect* Church of that city.

But what, it may now be asked, had *St. Peter* to do with the *Assyrian* Babylon?†

In reply to this inquiry let me remind you, that it has been well observed,‡ that there is something very significant in the *arrangement* of the names of the countries specified by the inspired Writer of the *Acts* of the *Apostles*, in his enumeration of the Jews of the dispersion who had flocked to Jerusalem on the Day of Pentecost, and were witnesses of the effects of the Descent of the Holy Ghost on the Apostles, and listened to *St. Peter's* sermon on that day, by which three thousand souls were added to the Church. "How hear we every man in our own tongue wherein we were born?"

Let us remark the Sacred Historian's order. First, "Parthians, Medes, and Elamites, and the dwellers in Mesopotamia and Judæa." These were the Jews of the dis-

great a number of *Jews* was found in *Babylonia* as is astonishing. They are spoken of by Josephus as possessing towns and districts in that country about forty years after Christ. They were in *great numbers* in *Babylon* itself." Cf. Vitringa Apoc. xviii. 2. *Judæi maximè* illum locum (*Sc. Babylonem*) tum temporis occupabant. See also Biscoe on the Acts of the Apostles, i. p. 88.

* See the authority in Cave, Life of the Apostles, p. 364.

† Prideaux supposed that St. Peter's Babylon is Seleucia on the Tigris, *i. e.* New Babylon. Connection, pt. I. Bk. viii. Vol. II. p. 432. This would not affect the argument.

‡ By Joseph Mede, Book i. Discourse xx.

persion* of the Two tribes and of the Ten tribes, and these Jews of the dispersion of the two tribes and of the ten tribes were now subject to the *Parthians*, whence the Parthians are named *first;* and of these the metropolis was *Babylon.*

Next come those of the Asiatic dispersion, who were *derived* from Babylon, and are called in the Acts, "the dwellers in Cappadocia, in Pontus and Asia, Phrygia and Pamphylia."

Hence we see why St. Peter, the Apostle of the Circumcision, went to *Babylon*—the Parthian Babylon. It was the head-quarters of those whom he himself had addressed with such wonderful success at Jerusalem on the day of Pentecost, and who are named *first* by the inspired Historian of the Acts.

Hence, also, we see, why, being at Babylon, St. Peter addressed an Epistle to the "strangers *scattered* throughout Pontus, Galatia, Cappadocia, Asia, and Bithynia." *They* were derived from Babylon; they were "*co-elect*" with the Church there. He had preached to *them* also at Jerusalem; and they are placed *second* by the inspired Writer of the Acts.

Hence, also, the Apostle St. John, who was stationed in *Asia*, among these strangers of the dispersion there, and who had been St. Peter's inseparable companion at Jerusalem,† and is particularly noticed as such in the Acts of the Apostles, takes up St. Peter's language, and responds from Asia to Parthia, from Ephesus to Babylon, from the *elect Sister* of the one‡ to the *elect Lady* of the other.§

* Concerning these several dispersions, see Mede, l. c. and particularly Bp. Pearson, Opera Posthuma, ii. p. 31, and Lightfoot, vol. ii. p. 1144, ed. Lond. 1684, and Gieseler, Eccl. Hist. § 17.

† See above, Lect. VII. p. 152. Acts iii. 1; iv. 19; viii. 14.

‡ 2 John 13.

§ 2 John 1. After the above had been written, I read with pleasure the following words of Estius (in Ep. I. Joh. Præf. p. 1201. ed. Rothomag. 1709): "Veterum traditio est ad *Parthos* scriptam esse Joannis

Hence, also, we shall see the appropriateness of the mention of *St. Mark* in St. Peter's salutation, "Thy co-elect sister greeteth thee; and so doth *Marcus my son*."

For, if we turn back to the enumeration in the Acts, we find, *first*, as I have said, the *Parthian* or Assyrian dispersion; *secondly*, the *Asiatic*, derived from the Parthian; thirdly and *lastly*, the *Ægyptian*, who were carried from Judæa into Ægypt by Ptolemy Lagus, or, as they are called by the sacred Historian of the Acts, "those of *Ægypt*, *and in the parts of Libya about Cyrene*, Jews and Proselytes, Cretes and Arabians; we do hear them speak in our own tongues the wonderful works of God."

These *three* Dispersions were, if we may so speak, St. Peter's audience at Jerusalem on the day of Pentecost; and they were the spiritual *Province* of that Apostle,—the Apostle of the Circumcision.

Now observe, how did St. Peter provide for all these three Dispersions which made up his Province?

He provided for the *first*, that of *Babylon*,* by visiting them in person.

He provided for the *second*, the *Asiatic*, by writing to it from Babylon.

He provided for the *third*, the *Ægyptian*, by sending to

Epistolam: Hunc titulum ei tribuunt Hyginus Papa, Epist. i. Possidius in Indic. Op. Augustini, et ipse Augustinus, Quæst. Evang. ii. c. 39. Denique et Joannes Secundus Papa in Epist. ad Valerium Episcopum: Scripsit autem ad *Parthos*, quæ gens sita erat juxta Medos, quod in ea regione plurimi essent Judæi ex antiqua dispersione decem tribuum; unde et Act. cap. 2, primo loco referuntur Parthi. Igitur quemadmodum Petrus Epistolam dedit ad Judæos dispersionis Ponti, &c., quos Lucas enumeravit posteriori loco, sic et Joannes scripsit ad Judæos in Oriente, id est, in Parthiâ cum locis adjacentibus, non ita tamen quin uterque Apostolus suam Epistolam communicatam voluerit etiam gentilibus earundem regionum qui in Christo crediderant utpote membris ejusdem Ecclesiæ."

* If any one is disposed to doubt whether the Babylon of St. Peter is the Babylon of Assyria, let me refer him to Lightfoot's Sermon on 1 Pet. v. 13, vol. ii. p. 1144.

them *Marcus his son*, who was the first Bishop of Alexandria.*

Thus, St. Peter, writing from Babylon to Asia, and sending the salutation of Mark, connects all the three dispersions together. Thus he took care of them all.

Time and the occasion do not allow that I should say any thing here on the reply, derived from these results, to the Romish identification of the Babylon of St. Peter's Epistle with *Rome;* and on the claim to universal spiritual supremacy set up for St. Peter, and through him for the Bishop of *Rome:* neither of which allegations is compatible with what has been now submitted to your consideration.

It has been already remarked that St. Peter, in his first Epistle, adopts parts of the Epistle of St. James. St. Jude, also, as we have seen, refers to St. James, and adopts the language of the Second of St. Peter, who recognizes as Scripture all the Epistles of St. Paul,† and incorporates a great part of the Epistle of St. Jude. St. John, in his Epistle, responds to the First of St. Peter, and interweaves the same thoughts and words in all his three Epistles.

This mutual intertexture, if I may so call it, is a remarkable characteristic of the Books of Scripture.‡

The second and third Evangelists, St. Mark and St. Luke, pursued a wise and sure method of warranting the truth and genuineness of each former Gospel with all the authority of the latter. This they did by quoting its words. *In the mouth of two or three witnesses every word is established.* Thus these Evangelists became joint *vouchers* for the truth of the genuine GOSPELS, and, at the same time, joint *opposers*§ of the spurious ones, which were obtruded on the

* See S. Jerome's Cat. Script. Eccl. viii.

† 2 Pet. iii. 15, 16. See above, Lect. VII. VIII. IX.

‡ See above, p. 131.

§ Compare Townson's Works, p. 229; and Dr. Owen's Observations on the Four Gospels, p. 109.

world. The *fourth* Evangelist, St. John, pursued a different course for doing the same thing; he declared his approval of the foregoing Gospels, not by adopting, but, for the most part, by *omitting*, what they had related, and by *supplying* what they had omitted.

The same is true of the Apostolic EPISTLES; they also, as we have seen, are, as it were, entwined one with another in a loving embrace of words and sentiments. And the Inspiration of one aids in proving the Inspiration of all.

Thus, *all* the EPISTLES of the New Testament, as well as all the GOSPELS, cohere together, and confirm each other.

Further; as the beloved disciple, the blessed Evangelist and Apostle, ST. JOHN, whose life was prolonged far beyond that of any other writer of the New Testament, authenticates the *Gospels*, so he canonizes the *Epistles* likewise by his *silence*.

If what had been taught in them had been *erroneous*, he would have raised his voice against it. But, by *abstaining* from entering on those great and sublime doctrines handled by St. Paul and St. Peter, by St. James and St. Jude, in their Epistles, and by confining himself to the Doctrine of Christian *Love*, St. John showed his *approval* of what they had taught, and that it was *all-sufficient*, without any Additions or Developments, provided it was crowned with Charity.

Thus, we see, the Unity of plan on which the Gospels and Epistles are written bears witness to their derivation from One and the Same Spirit. And the testimony to their Inspiration from the same beloved Disciple, St. John, is a guarantee to us of the Divine sanction of HIM, on whose breast that Disciple leaned, and drank in Wisdom from His mouth.

We return, for a short time, to the *five* above-mentioned Catholic Epistles.

We find that these Epistles, bearing the names of Apostles

of Christ, were received as Scripture in primitive times, by persons who were admirably qualified to judge of their authority.

It is true, they were not received at once *by all.* Scripture, like all instruments in which God is pleased to use man's agency, is subject to the laws of Time and Space. The Books of Scripture *could not* be *known* at once *to all;* and it was very necessary, as we have observed, that they, to whom these writings were brought, should carefully examine their claims before they received them as divine. This examination required time. Some Churches had better opportunities of ascertaining their Inspiration than others, and received them at once; while others, whose means of deciding were less, suspended their judgment. If we may so speak, there was *no conspiracy* in their favour. One Church after another tried them; one Church after another approved them; till at length they were received by all; and this final Universal reception is an irrefragable proof that those Churches were right, which received them at the first.

Let us also remark that the *doubts* which were entertained concerning these Epistles in some parts of the Church, in early times, are strong confirmations of the Inspiration of those *other main* portions of Scripture,—I mean the Gospels, the Acts of the Apostles, and St. Paul's Epistles, and the first Epistle of St. Peter and St. John,—concerning which *no* doubt was ever entertained in *any* part of the Church. The doubts concerning the one show that the authority of the other was indubitable. Thus, these doubts serve a double purpose: by their *existence*, as to these *five* Epistles, they prove that there was no room for doubting with respect to the other Books of Scripture; and by being *overcome*, in the case of these Epistles, they show that these Epistles are of equal authority with those concerning which no doubt was ever entertained at all.

Now, therefore, we turn to the allegations mentioned at the beginning of our Discourse.

Is it true that the Canon of the New Testament was not settled till the fourth century?

Certainly not. The Canon of Scripture was settled as soon as it was written; and it was not in the power of the whole world to unsettle it. The Books of Scripture did not *become* inspired by time. Eternity cannot raise the word of man into the word of God, nor reduce the word of God into the word of man. They were inspired from the beginning; and by those who had the best means of judging, they were *received* as inspired from the first. Others doubted, and were convinced. But it is no less preposterous to allege that the Canon of Scripture was not settled till the fourth century, than it would be to say that the Resurrection of our Lord was not believed by the Apostles, till St. Thomas exclaimed, *My Lord and My God.*

Next, it has been asked by Divines of Rome, Since the Rule of Faith must be known, and since some portions of Scripture were not universally received till the fourth century, can Scripture be the Rule of Faith?

To this, we answer, Scripture,—that is, the Word of God *written*,—is not the Rule of Faith to those to whom it is *not given* or to those who *cannot* know it to be the Word of God. But it *is* the Rule of Faith to *all* to whom it *is given*. This then is the question, Is the Scripture given to *us?* Has it been avouched to *us* by God, as His Word? This, I say, is *the* question, the *only* question, for *us*. And if this question is answered in the affirmative, then, *Scripture is the* RULE OF FAITH to *us*. And let us not be deceived by the sophistry which would endeavour to persuade us, that, because *all* parts of Scripture were not equally known as Scripture to *all* Christians in the world for some centuries, and, we might add, are not known *even now*,—especially where the reading of Scripture *is prohibited*,—therefore

Scripture is not the RULE of FAITH to *those* who *have had* the Scripture in their possession for nearly two thousand years. Rather let us fear lest we incur the doom pronounced upon those who "err, not knowing the Scriptures, nor the power of God."

Next, we must be carefully on our guard against that other dangerous error of the Church of Rome, in placing these five Catholic Epistles in the same category with the Apocrypha of the Old Testament.

Of the Authors of the Apocrypha let us ever speak with respect. But it is no mark of veneration to them, to raise them to a level with those who were inspired by the Holy Ghost, any more than it is real reverence for the Saints of God, to worship them in the place of GOD. If the Authors of the Apocrypha were now alive, they would be the first to exclaim, *See thou do it not.** They themselves, doubtless, would be the first to declare the immense difference between their own writings and the Catholic Epistles, and to protest with sorrow and indignation against that sin which has put them in the same class, and called them by the same name.

We, (these holy men would say,) wrote when the Prophetical Spirit had ceased in Israel. Christ's hands were never laid on our heads.† We never felt His divine breath. But it *was* vouchsafed to the Apostles, the Authors of these Catholic Epistles, to be blessed by the Son of God. They were baptized with the Holy Ghost and with fire. They wrote, not as we, when the Spirit was *withdrawn*, but when it was *given*. We confess our own failings; they claim to be inspired. We will not dare to break within the veil into the Holy of Holies, where the Ark is enshrined, and the Books of the Law are deposited by God's own command; we will not with sacrilegious hands, place our own writings there; we will not be guilty of profanely obtruding our Books into

* Rev. xix. 10; xxii. 9. † Luke xxiv. 50.

the hands of Christ Himself, and of telling Him, who knoweth all things, that they are no less divine than those Scriptures which were given by God to His people, and which He, the Son of God, received, and commanded all others to receive as the Oracles of God. No, we will not do this. Nor will we thrust our own writings into the hands of the Church, and bid her accept them as of the same authority with those which Christ has delivered to her as the Word of God.

Oh! that the voice of the Apostle and Evangelist St. John could reach the Roman Diotrephes, who bringeth in and casteth out of the Church according to his will; who mutilates the New Testament that he may add to the Old, and disturbs the foundation of Apostles and Prophets, Jesus Christ Himself being the head corner-stone, that he may erect a throne for himself upon the ruins!

Lastly. The SEVEN CATHOLIC EPISTLES are the Voice of Christ to the World, and they ought to be heard and read with special reference to two great events; the one past, the destruction of Jerusalem,—the other future,—of which that one was the type,—the Last Judgment. In the Epistle of St. James, and the First Epistle of St. Peter, we hear, as it were, the dirge of Jerusalem; in the others, the funeral knell of the World.

In the former, the Judge standeth at the door, to execute vengeance on the guilty city. "Weep and howl, ye rich men, for your miseries that shall come upon you; ye have lived in pleasure, and been wanton; ye have nourished your hearts as in a day of slaughter. All flesh is as grass, and all the glory of man as the flower of the field; the grass withereth and the flower thereof fadeth away, but the Word of the Lord endureth for ever. The time is come that judgment must begin at the house of God. The end of all things is at hand; a fiery trial is to try you."

Thus a warning was given of those miseries which were endured by the City which rejected and condemned the Just

One. Before that generation had passed away, in which that dreadful deed was done, it became the prey of Famine, Pestilence, and War, by which more than a million of persons were destroyed, and woes were endured, such as the world had never seen; and at last, Jerusalem was burnt, and trodden under foot by the Gentiles.

The last days of Jerusalem are prophetic of the last age of the World. And the warnings addressed to the Jews intimately concern us who live in the last times. In the Epistles, therefore, which relate to Jerusalem, we see much to excite serious reflection and sober awe in ourselves. And the other Catholic Epistles, which prophesy of the Great Day, speak still more forcibly to us.

It may be, my beloved brethren, that the Great Day is still distant. But death cannot be far off from any of us; and such as we are at our death, such shall we be at the Tribunal of Christ.

Besides, though men are naturally most strongly impressed with what happens before their own eyes, yet, all allowance being made for this fact, it cannot, I think, be denied that our own condition, in this age and country, is one which ought to awaken the most earnest thoughts.

It was the folly and sin of the Jews to see nothing alarming in their own state. *Ye hypocrites*, (says our Lord,) *how is it that ye cannot discern the signs of the times?* Their blindness, we know, led to their ruin. And assuredly there is much, very much, in the world about us, to remind us of the latter days of Jerusalem, and of the Final Consummation of all things.

Physical and civil calamities, Plagues, Pestilence, and Famine, Discord political and religious, the heaving and rocking of the foundations of society, as if they were moved from beneath us by some dark and unquiet spirit, the open renunciation of Christianity by some of the most powerful

Nations of the world (God grant that we ourselves be not of that number!); the impious avowal on their part that the Gospel shall no more be their Charter, and Christ no longer their King; the public encouragement of Error as if it were Truth, and the open persecution of Truth as if it were Error; the profanation of spiritual things by secular force, and the patronage of unchristian principles and practices by Powers professing to be spiritual; their attempts to dignify Lawlessness by the title of Liberty, and to sanctify Rebellion by the name of Religion; the letting loose of wild licentiousness; in a word, the preference of Barabbas to CHRIST; these and other circumstances which are doubtless present to your minds, and on which I will not now dilate, will be enough to direct your thoughts to that awful Hour "in which the heavens shall pass away with a great noise, and the elements shall melt with fervent heat;" and the Lord "shall come with ten thousands of His saints to execute judgment."

These things, my beloved brethren, will inspire you with godly fear, lest you yourselves be overtaken by a doom like that of Jerusalem. They will teach you "to possess your souls in patience;" to make the LAW of GOD the Rule of all your actions; to meditate, watch, and pray. They will excite you to stand firm, to "quit you like men, and be strong;" for "he that endureth to the end, shall be saved," and "nothing can harm you if ye be followers of that which is good;" they will constrain you to perform all the duties of your respective callings with faithfulness and love. As Rulers and Subjects, as Parents and Children, as Masters and Servants, you will do all with a full sense of the solemn importance of the words of the Apostle, "Seeing then that all these things shall be dissolved, what manner of persons ought ye to be in all holy conversation and godliness, looking for and hasting unto the coming of the day of God?"

LECTURE XII.

Rev. i. 9—11.

"*I John, who also am your brother, and companion in tribulation, and in the kingdom and patience of Jesus Christ, was in the isle that is called Patmos, for the word of God, and for the testimony of Jesus Christ. I was in the Spirit on the Lord's day, and heard behind me a great voice, as of a trumpet, saying, I am Alpha and Omega, the first and the last: and, What thou seest, write in a book, and send it unto the seven churches which are in Asia.*"

SOME critics in our own day, especially on the continent of Europe,* have affirmed, in confident terms, that the APOCALYPSE, or BOOK of REVELATION, ought not to be received as the work of the Evangelist St. John.

A belief in the Genuineness and Inspiration of the Books which we receive as Scripture is the groundwork of our faith and hope; and whatever weakens this foundation, undermines the fabric of Christianity. Therefore, on general grounds, this question demands our serious attention.

Besides, the APOCALYPSE itself has a peculiar character: it foretells the future. If it is indeed the Word of God,

* Particularly Lücke, Bretschneider, Ewald, De Wette, Schott, Credner, &c. "If" (says Lücke, Commentar. über die Schriften d. Ev. Joannes, iv. p. 388,) "St. John wrote the Gospel which bears his name, he cannot be the Author of the Apocalypse." De Wette Einleit. § 189, and Ewald Comment. p. 76, say the same thing, in similar language.

then no one can question the reality of a Future Judgment, and of Heaven and Hell. All these are here portrayed in the most vivid colours; and proportioned to their importance is that of the present question concerning the Authority of the Apocalypse.

We receive the Apocalypse as the Word of God. We build upon it as such. We shall hereafter* have occasion to show how safe and impregnable a fortress it affords us against the fierce assaults of sceptical Philosophy, ungodly Polity, and corrupt Religion, by which we are assailed. It therefore concerns us all to know that our house is founded on a Rock; that the Apocalypse is true; that it is based on the everlasting foundation of Him who was, and is, and will never cease to be.

In pursuance of this design let me call your attention, in the first place, to a strong presumptive proof of the divine authority of the Apocalypse.

1. The Apocalypse *completes* the Canon of Scripture; and, with reverence be it said, the Sacred Canon would be imperfect without it. This arises from the peculiar character of this Book.

Almighty God has been pleased to say, that "He will do nothing, but He revealeth His secrets to His servants the Prophets."† Therefore it was reasonably to be expected that *some* prophetical Book, revealing the future history of the Church under the *New* Dispensation, would be given by God to her, in the same manner as prophetical books for a like purpose were vouchsafed under the *Old* Dispensation.

But *no* Book of the *New* Testament, except the Apocalypse, possesses a prophetic character; no such *prophetical* Book has ever been received by the *Christian* Church, except the Apocalypse; and therefore we conclude, that the

* Lectures on the Apocalypse or Book of Revelation.

† Amos, iii. 7.

Apocalypse is a Canonical Book, and was *necessary* for the completion of the Canon.

2. Let us now open the Apocalypse.

It presents itself to us as the REVELATION of JESUS CHRIST. Such are its first words.

Is it a genuine Revelation, or no?

At the commencement of the Christian era, as we learn from ancient accredited* witnesses, there were many supposititious and heretical books in circulation, with such titles as the following,—

The Revelation of Peter.
The Revelation of Paul.
The Revelation of Thomas.

These were *spurious* Revelations, purporting to come from Apostles of Christ. But they have their value, as proving to us the existence of *some genuine* Apostolic Revelation at that time. No one forges counterfeits of *imaginary* coins: the false medal indicates that there is a genuine one, of a similar form, in circulation. The glass reflects the jewel; the shadow follows the substance. Now, there is not, and never has been, *any* Book of Revelation in existence which the Christian Church has recognized as a genuine Apostolic work, except the Apocalypse. Therefore the Apocalypse is *the* true Revelation. It is the *sterling coin*, of which those other Revelations were counterfeits. And thus the frauds of heretical utterers of base money serve to prove the truth of the divine archetype.

3. Let us advance a step further.

Every one who opens the Apocalypse must be struck with its commanding tone and majestic dignity. It proclaims itself as the Revelation of JESUS CHRIST. "Hear what the

* See the account of the *twelve* different Apocryphal Books of Apocalypse or Revelation in Fabricius, Codex Apoc. N. T. Pt. ii. p. 935, and the authorities cited by Jones on the Canon, i. p. 26—33, and by Lücke, Commentar. p. 45—50.

Spirit saith unto the Churches;" such is the conclusion of each of its Seven Epistles to the Seven Churches. "Blessed is he who readeth and keepeth the words of this prophecy. I testify unto every man that heareth the words of the prophecy of this book, If any man shall add unto these things, God shall add unto him the plagues that are written in this book; and if any man shall take away from the words of the book of this prophecy, God shall take away his part out of the book of Life."

Such is the solemn language of the Apocalypse concerning itself.

Are not these words from Heaven?

Again. Not only does the Author thus lay *claim* to inspiration, but he professes to *exercise* a gift peculiar to Almighty God. He *predicts the future.* He lays open a long avenue of events, rising up one after another in clear perspective through the interval of time, extending from that Lord's day in which he was in the Spirit upon the shores of the isle of Patmos even to the Day of Doom. He opens the gates of Heaven; he displays the Throne of the Most High; he places us amid the angelic hierarchy, and bids us listen to seraphic melodies; he sounds the trumpets of God's judgments, and pours out the vials of His wrath on a guilty world; he calls us to witness the destruction of the seven-hilled Babylon; he unseals the bottomless pit; he discloses the dark abyss; he shows us the awful scenes of the general Resurrection and of the Day of Judgment: in a word, he reveals the future, till Time is lost in Eternity.

What, therefore, must we now say? One of two alternatives: *either* the author of the Apocalypse is divinely inspired, *or* else, with reverence be it said, he is guilty of profanely usurping the name and attributes of God.

4. Still further;

If we survey the opening chapters of the Apocalypse, we find that they consist of epistolary addresses, directed to the

seven Angels of seven Churches in seven celebrated cities in that region of the world, which, in the language of the New Testament, is called Asia. This Asia, you will bear in mind, is *not* the vast tract of Asia according to the modern acceptation of the word, but it is, in Roman language, Proconsular Asia, or Lydia.* It was a Province of not more than one hundred miles square, watered on the north by the river Caycus, on the south by the Mæander, and bounded on the east by the Phrygian hills, and on the west by the Mediterranean sea. We take for granted,—what no one, I suppose, here present will call in question,—that the *Angels* of these seven Asiatic Churches are their several Chief Pastors, *the messengers of the Lord of Hosts;*† that is, as Christian antiquity witnesseth, their respective Bishops.‡

The language addressed by the author of the Apocalypse to these Angels or Bishops is very remarkable. He speaks to them with the voice of authority; he treats them as *his own inferiors;* and he regards them as responsible to himself. He *rebukes* them sharply, for the failings of their Churches in doctrine or in discipline.

Be it further observed, that these letters were addressed to the Angels of the Churches in order that they might be *read openly* in those Churches.§

* See Archbishop Ussher's Treatise "On the Original of Bishops and Metropolitans," Oxford, 1641, p. 53—96. The whole of that essay is very pertinent to the Apocalypse.

† Mal. ii. 7. Hag. i. 13.

‡ Bede, Explan. Apocalyps. in cap. i.

Septem stellæ angeli sunt septem ecclesiarum.] Id est, *rectores* ecclesiarum. Sacerdos enim, ut Malachias ait, *angelus Domini exercituum est.*—So Aquinas. cap. i. *Septem stellas,* septem *Episcopos* Ecclesiarum, per quos intelliguntur universi prælati qui sunt electi. Cap. i. p. 35, *Angelos* dicit *Episcopos* propter eminentiam vitæ quam debet habere prælatus.—See also Abp. Ussher, l. c.

§ See Lightfoot on Rev. iii. The phrase "Angel of the Church" is equivalent, he observes, to שליח צבור "the Minister of the Syna-

Thus these rebukes were *public*.

It is also worthy of remark, that, in his original Greek, the epithets, (such as *dead*, *hot*, *cold*, *poor*, *rich*, *blind*, *naked*,* and the like,) which the writer uses to characterize the qualities and condition of these several Churches, agree in gender not with the feminine word *Church*, as might have been expected, but with the masculine word *Angel*. They are all masculine; not one feminine. So that the address to the *Churches* is *personal* to their several *Angels*. The author lays on each Angel the failings of his particular Church, and thereby (we may remark in passing) he gives a most solemn view of Episcopal Responsibility.

Observe now more closely how he speaks of the seven Churches thus personified by their Chief Pastors. He remonstrates with Ephesus for having left its first love. The Angel of Pergamos is reproved for conniving at the doctrine of Balaam. Thyatira is censured for suffering a Jezebel to teach. Sardis has a name to live, but is dead. Laodicea is neither hot nor cold. For all these faults and corruptions the Angels of the respective Churches are held accountable, and are reproved publicly by the Writer of the Apocalypse.

Again; he gives them advice, as a Father would to his Children. He exhorts them to *strengthen the things that remain:* he promises them rewards for fidelity and perseverance. If they fall away, their *candlestick* shall be *removed;* but he *that overcometh* shall *eat of the fruit of the tree of life*, and shall receive a crown of never-fading glory.

Who now, it may be asked, is he, that comes forth from the shores of Patmos to address this language of reproof to the venerable Bishops of Asia? Who shall thus summon

gogue," who took care for the *public reading* of the Law and the Prophets; and these Epistles are sent accordingly to the ministers in the several Churches, to be *read* openly in the congregation.

* In Chapters ii. and iii.

them before him, as to a judicial tribunal? Who pronounce such verdicts upon them? Can it be any ordinary man who thus speaks and acts? Can a Layman, can a Presbyter, can even a brother Bishop address such language as this to the Chief Pastors of the Asiatic Churches? to men who have received their commission from the first followers of Christ, and have had the hands of Apostles laid on their heads? In those early days at least, when respect for constituted authority was regarded as a part of religion; and when *they* were severely censured, who intruded into the province of others,* and uttered rash judgments concerning their spiritual Guides; such language from an inferior, or even from an equal, to Christian Bishops, would have been impossible.

We are brought, therefore, to this conclusion: *either* the Author of the Apocalypse *was* some person who stood in a peculiar, and, we add, in the *unique* relation of an Ecclesiastical *Superior* to these Asiatic Angels; or else we must confess that, in employing such language as that in which he addressed them, he usurped the prerogative of an office which no faithful Christian would have dared to invade.

It may indeed be said, that a person, *inferior* in dignity to the Seven Angels of Asia, might still have been employed by Almighty God to exhort and reprove them, as Samuel was employed to rebuke Eli. This is indeed *possible;* and this supposition, let me observe, *concedes* the *divine mission* of the Writer; that is, it grants the point at issue—his *Inspiration.*

At the same time, though it be allowed to be *possible,* that an *inferior* should be authorized and commissioned by God to administer a rebuke to a superior and that *publicly* (which Samuel was not commissioned to do to Eli); yet it is much more *probable* that He, who is the Lover of Order,

* ἀλλοτριοεπίσκοποι, 1 Pet. iv. 15.

especially in His Church, should have employed the Ministry of a *Superior*, appointed by Himself, to rebuke and correct an inferior.

Either, therefore, the Writer of the Apocalypse was inspired by God, and (as we apprehend, and shall hereafter show) *superior* to the Seven Angels; *or* else he assumed a function which did not belong to him, and he acted in a manner irreconcileable with Christian duty; and the Apocalypse would have been rejected by those to whom it was sent.

We shall inquire presently, *how* it was treated by those to whom it was sent. In the mean time we observe, that this authoritative and increpatory tone, to which I have adverted, may be regarded as presumptive evidence of the superior dignity of the Writer. By using it, he proves that he is persuaded of the validity of his own claim to Inspiration. He will not *prophesy smooth things* to the Churches: he will not bribe the Angels by flattery. No. He will tell them the truth, even at the risk of offending some, or of creating opposition from all. Observe, too, how he does, what no forger would ever have done, he challenges examination of his own claims. He *praises* one of the Churches, that of Ephesus, for having tried and convicted a false prophet, and thus invites them to examine *his own* prophecy. "I know thy works, that thou canst not bear them that are evil: thou hast tried them which say they are Apostles, and are not, and hast found them liars."* He thus courts a scrutinizing examination of his own credentials. He will take good care, that no one shall be able to say, that the reception of the Apocalypse was due to any persuasive arts of the writer, and not to its being from God.

5. We are now arrived at a very important point in our inquiry.

* Rev. ii. 2.

How was the Apocalypse received by the Seven Angels and Seven Churches of Asia?

Happily we have abundant materials for a reply to this question.

The first witness is Papias, Bishop of Hierapolis, a city at a very few miles distance from Laodicea, one of the Seven Churches. He was, also, a disciple of St. John, and a contemporary with, and in a certain sense a colleague of, the Seven Angels, whom the Author of the Apocalypse addressed.* He was very diligent in collecting memorable facts concerning the Apostles, and their works: and he received the Apocalypse as the work of the Evangelist St. John.†

His testimony is of greater value, on account of his nearness to Laodicea; for the Church of Laodicea could not have been ignorant of the authorship of a book addressed to *itself;* and if the Apocalypse had *not* been the work of St. John, we cannot imagine that the Laodiceans would have allowed such an unfavourable‡ character of their Church, as is given in the Apocalypse, to be circulated throughout Christendom,§ in the name and with the authority of St.

* Iren. v. 33. Παπίας Ἰωάννου ἀκουστὴς, Πολυκάρπου δὲ ἑταῖρος.— Euseb. iii. 39. S. Hieron. Catal. Script. xviii. Tom. iv. p. 109, and Epist. ad Theodoram, iv. p. 581.

† As the *fact* of this testimony of Papias has been recently questioned by some, it may be necessary to state that Andreas and Arethas (Prolog. in Apocalyp.) refer to Papias, as vouching for the inspiration of the Apocalypse; and that Irenæus, who unhesitatingly affirms it to be St. John's, refers to Papias as among his authorities (Hær. v. 33): and Eusebius speaks of the doctrine of Papias proceeding from αἱ ἀποστολικαὶ διηγήσεις, Euseb. iii. 39; and Papias appears to have commented on the Apocalypse. See the important Scholium in Cramer's Catena, Rev. xii. 7—9.

‡ Rev. iii. 14—18.

§ It may be questioned whether a feeling of shame *did not* in fact operate on the Council of *Laodicea*, and lead to the omission of the Apocalypse from its list of books to be *read publicly*.

John. If the Apocalypse had been a forgery, they must have known it to be so; and knowing it so to be, they must have exposed it to the world.

This observation, you will observe, applies to others of the Seven Churches, who are addressed in similar terms of rebuke: and it adds much weight to the important facts, first, that there is a great amount of primitive testimony from the Seven Churches, assigning the Apocalypse to St. John; and that there is none from that quarter which ascribes it to any one else.

The next testimony to which we would refer is that of Justin Martyr. He was born at Sichem in Samaria at the beginning of the second century, and was eminent for his erudition, which was improved by intercourse with Christian and Heathen Philosophers in Egypt, Italy, and other countries which he visited. About the middle of the second century he came to the city of *Ephesus*, where he held a two days' conference with Trypho, one of the most learned Jews of his day. In the narrative which he published of this dialogue, Justin Martyr quotes the *Apocalypse*, and affirms that it is written by one of the *Apostles* of Christ, whose name is *John*.*

This assertion, be it observed, was made only about half a century after the death of St. John, and it was made at *Ephesus* the mother city of Asia, the principal of the Seven Churches, the city in which St. John passed a great part of his life, in which he died, and in which he was buried.† This testimony, therefore, of Justin Martyr, is of great value; and it confirms the proof, that St. John was the Author of the Apocalypse.

* Euseb. iv. 18, διάλογον ἐπὶ τῆς Ἐφεσίων πόλεως πρὸς Τρύφωνα τῶν τότε Ἑβραίων ἐπισημότατον πεποίηται· μέμνηται τῆς Ἰωάννου Ἀποκαλύψεως σαφῶς τοῦ Ἀποστόλου αὐτὴν εἶναι λέγων.

† S. Justin Dialog. c. Tryphone, c. 80, 81. See also S. Hieron. Catal. c. ix.

We pass next to the evidence of Melito. He was Bishop of one of the Seven Churches, *Sardis*, in the second century; a successor, therefore, of one of the Seven Angels addressed in the Apocalypse. The witness of Sardis and its Bishop cannot be suspected of *partiality;* for Sardis, again, is one of the Churches which is rebuked with great severity in the Apocalypse. "Thou hast a name that thou livest, and art dead."* And the character of Melito stands pre-eminently high both for piety and learning. He is, therefore, a very credible witness. It is a very pleasing reflection, that the reproofs of the Apocalypse were not without their fruits: and probably the pious vigilance of Melito, the Bishop of Sardis, was quickened by them. He laboured diligently for the souls committed to his care; especially in establishing their faith in the Word of God. He showed a most laudable zeal with regard to the Canon of the Old Testament. In order to assure himself and his Church of Sardis concerning the Books of the Ancient Scriptures, as received by the Churches of Palestine, he visited that country in person, and he has given the result of his critical inquiries in a very interesting and valuable Epistle.† And it cannot be supposed that *he* who, we see, was so diligent and circumspect in his inquiries concerning the *Old* Testament, would have been less careful respecting the *New*, and especially concerning *that* particular *Book* of the New Testament, the Apocalypse, which contains an address to his own predecessor, and to his own Church; and to which, on other grounds, his best consideration must have been given, for he wrote a Commentary‡ upon the Apocalypse.

The evidence, therefore, of Melito is very important. He also received the Apocalypse as the work of St. John.

The latest witness to whom we shall here appeal is St.

* Rev. iii. 1.

† Euseb. iv. 26. S. Hieron. Catal. c. xxiv. See above, Lect. III.

‡ Euseb. v. 26. S. Hieron. Catal. xxiv.

Irenæus. He was probably a native of Asia Minor, whence he migrated to France, where he became Bishop of Lyons towards the close of the second century. In his youth he had been acquainted with St. Polycarp, who was placed in the see of Smyrna by the Apostles, and, as some affirm, by St. John himself;* and who is supposed by learned men—for instance, by Archbishop Ussher—to be no other than the *Angel of the Church of Smyrna*, who is addressed in the Apocalypse.

In his great work against heresies, published only about ten years after St. Polycarp's martyrdom, Irenæus refers to the Apocalypse.† He mentions *ancient* Manuscripts of it, which he himself had examined; and he speaks of a particular *reading*‡ of a particular passage§ in the Apocalypse, (that concerning the *number* of the Beast,) as being confirmed by the authority of those "who had seen St. John face to face." In this single work he quotes the Apocalypse no less than twenty times; he makes long extracts from it; and speaks of it in the most unhesitating manner, as inspired Scripture, and as the work of St. John.

The testimony of St. Irenæus is of more value, because it was probably derived from Asiatic Bishops; for example, from Papias, whom he mentions as an authority, and especially from St. Polycarp,‖ whose life, like that of his Master, St. John, seems to have been providentially prolonged to almost a patriarchal duration, in order that he might be a witness of the living Voice of Apostolic Teaching, till the Written Word was generally diffused.

* Tertullian. de Præscr. c. 32. S. Iren. iii. 3, 4. ap. Euseb. v. 20. cp. Euseb. iv. 14. S. Hieron. Catal. S. C. xvii.

† Clinton, Fasti Romani, A. D. 166. Cave, i. pp. 66, 67. de Irenæo.

‡ Iren. v. 30. cf. Euseb. v. 8. Irenæus also quotes the Apocalypse as St. John's in Fragm. Pfaff. p. 25.

§ Rev. xiii. 18.

‖ Euseb. iv. 14. v. 20.

Such, then, is the testimony from the country* to which the Apocalypse was originally sent; such, we say, is the contemporary witness of the Asiatic Churches to which it was addressed. Next: be it carefully remembered, that not a tittle of evidence of a *contrary* kind can be adduced from those Churches, and from that age.

No doubt whatever was entertained by the Apocalyptic Churches concerning the inspiration and genuineness of the Apocalypse. On the contrary, *those* were *condemned* as holding heretical opinions, the Alogi, for instance, of the second century, who denied the Apocalypse to be St. John's.† Very striking are the words of Tertullian, at the close of the second century:—"We can appeal to the Churches which are the foster-children of St. John; for though Marcion, *the heretic, rejects his Apocalypse*, yet the series of the Asiatic Bishops derives its origin from St. John."‡ All the Apocalyptic Churches ascribed the Apocalypse to St. John.

6. Let us now pause here for a moment, and consider the facts before us.

A Writing, claiming to be from Heaven, dictated in language of the most solemn and sublime kind, predicting future events, presenting a series of prophetical pictures of the World's History to the end of Time, is sent to Seven Apostolic Churches of the most distinguished cities in the light and splendor of Asia: to Ephesus, the rich emporium of the East; to Smyrna, the nurse of Poets; and to Sardis,

* Mr. I. C. Knight, in pp. 12—15 of an ingenious Essay on the Apocalypse, (Lond. 1842,) has shown reason for believing, that St. Ignatius, in Epist. ad Philad. 6, imitated the words in Rev. iii. 12, which, he observes, were addressed to the same Church, that of Philadelphia; and therefore St. Ignatius, the friend of Polycarp, and scholar of St. John, may be added to the witnesses in favour of the inspiration of the Apocalypse.

† Epiphan. Hæres. li. 3, 4, 32, 33. Philastr. Hæres. lx. al. 13.

‡ Tertullian, c. Marcion. iv. 5. See ibid. iii. 14.

the ancient residence of Kings. It purports to come from an exile on the barren rock of Patmos, an isle almost within sight of Ephesus, and therefore very accessible to those to whom the book is sent; it speaks in the voice of authority to those Churches, and to their spiritual Rulers; it pronounces judicial sentence upon them; it rebukes their failings, and commends their virtues; it promises blessings to those who receive the words of its own prophecy, and denounces eternal woe on all who add to, or take away from, it. In a word, it speaks to men as being itself from God.

And what is the *result?*

This Book—with these claims, reproofs, promises, and threats—is received by all these Churches as the Word of God; and is ascribed by them to the beloved Disciple, the blessed Apostle and Evangelist, St. John.

Such is their testimony; and they could not have been deceived in this matter. St. John was no stranger to them. He lived and he died among them. If then the Apocalypse is *not* from God, and if it is not the work of St. John, it cannot be imagined that the Apostolic Churches of Asia would have conspired to receive it. Their duty, both to God and to the Apostle, required them not to do so. So far from *receiving* it, the Angels of these Churches, with one voice, would have protested against it. *Not* only they would *not have* recognized it as divine, not only they would not have received it as the work of St. John, but they would have *condemned* it as falsely ascribed to the Apostle, and impiously laying claim to the incommunicable attributes of God. It would have taken a place among those *spurious* Revelations (to which we have referred) which were ascribed by heretics to Peter, Paul, and Thomas; and the world would have heard no more of the APOCALYPSE of ST. JOHN.

7. We are now arrived at a point of our argument, in which we are led to observe, that we have other evidence—

I mean *silent* evidence—in behalf of the inspiration and genuineness of the Apocalypse: and this evidence is of the most cogent kind; for it is the evidence of St. John himself.

The Apocalypse was published at the close of the reign of the Roman Emperor Domitian;* that is, about the year of our Lord 95. Some have assigned an *earlier*,† but no one a *later*, date than this. Now it is certain that St. John survived till the reign of the Emperor Trajan;‡ that is, till, or beyond the year of our Lord 100. Some authorities place his death so low as the year 120.§ Certain, also, it is, that in, or soon after, the year 100, when he had returned from Patmos, the Bishops of Asia, that is, the Angels of the Seven Churches, whom the Author of the Apocalypse had addressed, came to St. John at Ephesus, to which city he returned after his banishment in Patmos, and where he then resided, and that they brought to him copies of the three Gospels of St. Matthew, St. Mark, and St. Luke, and desired of him a public declaration of his Apostolical judg-

* "*Historia nota est*," says Bede, Explan. Apocalyps. in cap. i. "Joannem a Domitiano Cæsare propter evangelium in hanc insulam relegatum; cui tunc congrue secreta datum est cœli penetrare, cum certa terrarum spatia negabatur excedere."—Lampe, Prolegom. ad Joann. 61, 62, says: "*Tota antiquitas* in eo *abundè* consentit quod *Domitianus* exilii Joannis author fuit." Cp. Vitringa, Anacr. ad Rev. iv. 1, and vi. 1.

† The use of the *Pauline* Benediction, Rev. i. 4, xxii. 21, is a conclusive proof that it could not have been written under Nero. See above, pp. 191, 192.

‡ Hieron. Script. Eccl. v. Joannes.

§ S. Chrysostom (?) in S. Joann. Homil. tom. viii. p. 130, Appendix, ed. Paris, 1728. ἐξόριστος ὁ Ἰωάννης ὑπὸ Δομετιανοῦ εἰς τὴν νῆσον τὴν καλουμένην Πάτμον γίγνεται, διὰ τὸν λόγον τοῦ Θεοῦ, καὶ ἐκκλησίαν συγγράφει ἣν ἔδειξεν αὐτῷ ὁ Θεὸς καί Ἀποκάλυψιν μυστηρίων, ἔπειτα καὶ τὰς ἁγίας τρεῖς ἐπιστολὰς . . . εἶτα ἐπανελθὼν τῆς ἐξορίας καταλαμβάνει τὴν Ἔφεσον, κἀκεῖσε διατρίβων συντάττει τὸ Εὐαγγέλιον ὢν ἐτῶν ἑκατόν, διαρκέσας ἕως ὅλων ἑκατὸν εἴκοσιν. See other authorities in Lampe's Prolegomena.

ment concerning these Gospels; and that St. John openly pronounced these Three Gospels to be Authentic, Genuine, and Inspired; and that, at the earnest request of the same Asiatic Bishops, St. John composed his own Gospel, as the full and final consummation of the Evangelical Volume.*

This well-attested fact proves that the Apostle St. John, aged as he then was, was not only blessed with full intellectual vigour during his exile in Patmos, but that his faculties were preserved unimpaired after his return to Ephesus, and that he was in habits of intercourse with the Angels of the Seven Churches of Asia for some years *after* the Apocalypse was written.

Now, it will be remembered that St. John was the last surviving Apostle of Christ, and that he was also Metropolitan of Asia; and Ephesus, the civil capital of Asia, was his abode or Metropolitan See, from which he administered the ecclesiastical affairs of the Province of Proconsular Asia, or Lydia, in which all the Seven Churches were situated. It will be recollected, also, that St. John not only took an active part, as from his Apostolic character and office might be expected, in authenticating genuine Scriptures, as we have just seen; but that, as might also be expected, he exerted no less vigilance and authority in condemning supposititious books, pretending to be Scripture.

In one of his Epistles he says, "Beloved, believe not every spirit, but try the Spirits whether they are of God: for many deceivers are gone forth into the world."† And it is expressly recorded of him, that when a writing, *professing* to be a canonical history of the Acts of St. Paul, had been composed by a presbyter of the city of *Ephesus*, St. John convicted the Author, and condemned the book.‡

* See above, Lect. VI. and Photii Bibl. Cod. 254.

† 1 John iv. 1.

‡ See above, Lect. V.

Suppose now, for argument's sake, the *Apocalypse not* to be inspired, and *not* to be written by St. John.

Here is a book, speaking from Heaven; speaking in the name of Jesus Christ and of the Holy Spirit; speaking to the Bishops and Churches of Asia; that is, to those of *St. John's own province;* and exercising the very functions which belonged to St. John himself, and to him alone; assuming the office of administering rebuke and correction to the Bishops of St. John's own jurisdiction.

Even if any one can bring himself to imagine that the *seven* Asiatic *Angels*—devout and holy men, like Polycarp —would have tolerated such presumptuous usurpation, (which is, indeed, incredible,) no one, I apprehend, will suppose that the *one* Asiatic *Arch-angel*—I mean St. John—would have borne it. No; he would have treated the author of the Apocalypse as he treated Cerinthus. He would have condemned him as he condemned the Asiatic presbyter; and we should have known the author of the Apocalypse only as a second Diotrephes.

We conclude, then, from the *voice* of the *Angels*, and from the *silence* of the *Archangel*, that the Apocalypse is inspired, and that its Author is St. John.

8. Before we confirm this conclusion by a brief appeal to *internal* evidence, let us observe, that this *primitive* testimony could not be invalidated by more *recent* allegations of a contrary kind, even if those allegations did not admit of being easily refuted on other ground in addition to those of *lateness* in time.

Concerning this matter of *fact*, I mean the genuineness of the Apocalypse, the testimony of the Asiatic Churches of St. John's *own age* is worth more than all the opinions of *all* subsequent time. The truth also is, that all sceptical surmises on this matter, which are but slight and partial, may

be easily accounted for. First, (as will be shown elsewhere)* from the erroneous imputation of Millenarian doctrines to the Apocalypse, which cast a temporary cloud over it; and, next, from the reserve practised by *some* Churches,† (as, indeed, by our own,) not publicly reading the Apocalypse in their religious assemblies;‡ whence it came to pass that the Apocalypse was not inserted in some lists of Books to be read in the Church, and *thence* by some it was erroneously *imagined* not to be *Canonical*.

But these allegations, and all others of a like tendency, soon lost all credit; and the *primitive* belief concerning the inspiration and genuineness of the Apocalypse became universal. In the prophetic words of Eusebius,§—"Though men dispute on this side and that concerning the Apocalypse, yet assuredly in due time its claims will be acknowledged, on the ground|| of *primitive testimony*."

9. If now we open the Book itself, every thing there harmonizes with this belief.¶

The Author calls himself John. "I John, who am also your brother, and companion in tribulation.** John to the Seven Churches which are in Asia.†† I John saw these things and heard them."‡‡ *Whom* would this *name*, placed

* Lectures on the Apocalypse.

† Conc. Laod. can. lx. *Other* Churches pursued a different course. By a decree of the Fourth Council of Toledo, (A. D. 633, can. xvii.) a Presbyter was liable to excommunication if he did not read the Apocalypse in the Church at a certain period of the year.

‡ See Hooker, V. xx. 4, with Mr. Keble's note.

§ Euseb. iii. 24.

|| See also St. Jerome, ad Dardan. Ep. 129.

¶ I have not here entered into the question of alleged discrepancy of *style* between the Apocalypse and St. John's Gospel. (Euseb. vii. 25.) This has been already noticed, Lecture IX. and has been well discussed by Guerike, Einleitung in das N. T. § 60, p. 555. And, after all, the *subject* of the Apocalypse is so different from that of the Gospel, that arguments from *style* are scarcely admissible here.

** Rev. i. 9. †† Rev. i. 4. ‡‡ Rev. xxii. 8.

thus by itself without any epithet or accompaniment, suggest? Whom but the Apostle and Evangelist St. John? He, and he alone, was *John;* their brother and their pastor, and their guide: and no one else in his age, *writing to St. John's own Churches*, would have ventured to assume that name, in this bold and unqualified simplicity.

Again: the Author writes from the isle of Patmos, where he was *for the testimony of the Lord Jesus;* and we know that St. John was banished to that island by the Emperor Domitian, when he persecuted the Church.*

It may be asked, perhaps, Why then does he not *call* himself an *Apostle?* We ask, in reply, Why does not St. James?† Why does not St. Jude? Why does not St. John himself, in his Epistles? The name *John* would *suffice* to identify him; and, by not assuming the *title* of *Apostle*, and calling himself only a *servant* of God, and their *brother* in tribulations, he would show, that though he had *the gift of prophecy*, and was *permitted to understand all mysteries, and to speak with the tongue of Angels*, yet he was not elated above measure *by the abundance of his Revelations;* and the more he was exalted by God, the more he would humble himself with men. *The secret of the Lord is among them that fear Him; and mysteries are revealed to the meek.*

Further: the Author of the Apocalypse, modest as he is in the description of himself, speaks, as we have seen, to the Angels of Asia with all authority: he distributes praise and blame like a Ruler and a Judge. Now, there was only *one* person then alive in the whole world who was entitled to use this language; and *that one* person was not only entitled to use it, by his double character as the last surviving Apostle, and as Metropolitan of Asia, but he was solemnly *bound* to use it. By reason of his *office*, he was obliged, in duty to CHRIST, who called him to it, "to speak, and exhort, and

* See above pp. 254, 255. † See above, pp. 215, 216.

rebuke with all authority." He was pledged "to be no respecter of persons; to be instant in season, out of season; to reprove, rebuke, exhort." This one person was ST. JOHN.

Again: we find that the Author of the Apocalypse, who writes to the Seven Angels, or Bishops, gives them an Apostolic *Benediction*,—"The grace of our Lord Jesus Christ be with you."

And without all contradiction (says the Apostle) *the less is blessed of the better*, or *greater*. Therefore, again, we infer that the writer of the Apocalypse is some one greater than the Bishops of Asia. He is some one entitled to bless them. Now, there was one person in the world, and one alone, who, in a spiritual sense, was *greater* than the Bishops of Asia, and so was entitled to bless them, and might justly be expected to do so; and that person was St. John.

I leave it, my brethren, to you to consider the remarkable propriety which characterizes the divine selection of St. John, and particularly of St. John such as he was at Patmos, for the treatment of such sublime subjects as those which are described in the Apocalypse.

His Gospel proclaims what a Divine spirit was in him. Who so fit as he to speak of the mysteries revealed in the Apocalypse?

He was the beloved Disciple. He had been admitted to our Lord's most private retirements; to the most solemn scenes of His sufferings and sorrow. He had been with Him on the Mountain of Transfiguration, in the Garden of Gethsemane, in the High Priest's hall, and at the Cross.

All his brother Apostles had now been taken away by death. He was left the last. He was now a prisoner and an exile in a lonely island. As the winds blew, and as the waves dashed on the rocky shores of Patmos, so the storms of the world were now beating against the rock of the Church. But the aged and lonely Apostle was blessed and

cheered with glorious visions. He was visited by JESUS CHRIST. The exile from the world became a citizen of Heaven; and the barren cliffs of Patmos were made more beautiful than Paradise. The Man of Sorrows, whom St. John had beheld in His agony at Gethsemane, He whom he had seen standing bound before Caiaphas, crowned with thorns, mocked by Herod, condemned by Pilate, pierced by the soldier, and dying on the Cross, was now revealed to him enthroned in Heaven, and adored by myriads of Cherubim and Seraphim kneeling before Him. "I am Alpha and Omega, the First and the Last. I am He that liveth, and was dead; and, behold, I am alive for evermore, Amen; and have the keys of hell and of death." He is seen chaining Satan, and casting him into the gulf of fire. He is seen coming in the clouds of Heaven to judge the world. "He hath on His vesture His Name written, KING OF KINGS, and LORD OF LORDS." His Kingdom is established for ever. The Voices of Heaven cry, "Halleluia, for the Lord God Omnipotent reigneth." They who have been slain for Him, they who have kept His commandments, are seen glorified for ever. They are received into the heavenly palace, to the marriage feast of the Son of God. The former things are passed away. There is "no more death nor sorrow; and God wipes all tears from their eyes."

Consider how appropriate, how beautiful, how consistent it is with the affectionate tenderness of Christ for His dear and faithful servants, that He should cheer His beloved Disciple, St. John, now aged, alone, and an exile, with these glorious Visions; that He should show Himself in Heaven to him who had seen Him on the cross; that He should reveal Himself to him, as He will one day appear in His awful majesty, to judge the Quick and Dead. How significant also is it of Christ's love to His Church, sorrowing, afflicted, widowed in this world, that He should not call away His last surviving Apostle before He had revealed to him the future

glorious condition of the beloved Bride, when re-united to Her Lord in Heaven.

What, therefore, my Christian friends and brethren, can be more full of comfort to *us* than the view which this subject presents? Heaven is our home: here on earth we are exiles; we are in Patmos. Especially, in these our days, the heavens are dark; the sea is high; the waves dash upon the rock: "the floods are risen, O Lord; the floods have lift up their voice." Ours is an age of storms. The beach below us is strewn with wrecks—the wrecks of Empires. Yet in this dark gloom of the world, in this our solitude and exile, we may have inward peace, and light and hope and joy. If we love Christ with St. John, if we suffer for Christ with him, we too, like him, shall be visited by Christ. His Visions will be ours. His Revelation will be ours. Our Patmos, also, will be Paradise. And we shall pass from the storms of earth to the eternal sunshine of Heaven; and from the dreary solitude of our worldly exile to the blissful mansions of our Father's House. *Amen.*

APPENDIX.

APPENDIX A.

ROMISH VINDICATION OF THE TRENT CANON OF SCRIPTURE.

Vicenzi, Sessio Quarta Concilii Tridentini Vindicata Romæ, 1842.—p. 1. *Quid sibi velint in Scripturis vocabula* Proto-Canonicum *et* Deutero-Canonicum.

(*a*) Libris tum veteris tum novi testamenti nomen Scripturæ Proto Canonicæ vel Deutero-Canonicæ inditum fuit. Differentia autem istarum ex hoc orta est. *Proto-Canonici* libri ita appellati fuere, siquidem Ecclesia ipsos doctrina cœlesti præditos divinos semper cognovit, neque super his dubium aliquod vel ex Hebræorum, seu Christianorum parte exortum est. *Alteri* vero *Deutero-Canonici* nuncupati fuere in simplicem priorem distinctionem tantum, quatenus a Judæis rejecti, et Christiani nonnulli de iis siluerunt, vel de eorum divina auctoritate *primis* Ecclesiæ temporibus (si ita dicere fas est) *dubitarunt;* et, ut ait Bellarminus, "Quorum non semper æque certa atque explorata auctoritas fuit," *usque dum* Patres Concilii *Tridentini* legitime congregati sessione quarta istos libros divinos habendos *decreverunt,* eademque ac primos auctoritate præditos esse, adeo ut numeratis singillatim omnibus libris, quos nunc editio Vulgata exhibet, sic concludit: Ecclesia Catholica legi consueverunt, et in veteri Vulgata editione habentur, pro sacris et canonicis non suscepesit . . . . anathema sit." " Si quis libros ipsos integros cum omnibus suis partibus, prout in

II. Quamvis aliquando de horum Bibliorum divinitate dubitatum fuit, vel potius, si qui numero paucissimi, præter alios plurimos, qui contra hos stetere, Scripturas Deutero-Canonicas in dubium vocarunt; et si Ecclesia Christi de hac re siluit, nihil officit. Ecclesia enim primis temporibus hujus negotii solutionem *transegit, et opportunam non existimavit;* nisi dicere velimus, tunc temporis neque hæreticorum partes, nec singulare studium ad istarum Scripturarum auctoritatem labefactandam inter Christianos

extitisse; exquibus neque Ecclesiæ judicium de hac re exspectandum erat, etiamsi de hoc eidem persuasum esset, et firmam Deutero-Canonicarum veritatem teneret, ac divinitatem. Potissimum autem hoc summæ ejusdem Ecclesiæ prudentiæ est concedendum, cui contra Hebræos hasce Scripturas reprobantes agendum erat; ut hoc infra maxime patebit. *Quando autem opportunitatem animadvertit de istarum divina inspiratione firmanda,* et contra Lutherum et Calvinum eorumque commilitones, qui aperte divinum in ipsis afflatum negabant, et his diebus omni conatu adversantur, eadem Ecclesia contra eosdem judicium tulit, ac publico et generali decreto, perpetuæ constantique traditioni innixa, Deuterarum Scripturarum auctoritatem, earumque auctores, Spiritu Sancto afflante, scripsisse declaravit.

(*b*) IDEM VINCENZI, p. 46.—Tandem in quæstionem revocantes, quæ divus interpres Hieronymus, in libros Salomonis dixit: "*Legat, nempe, ad ædificationem plebis, non ad auctoritatem dogmatum ecclesiasticorum confirmandam.*" Et aliud in Tobiam: "*Cujus auctoritas ad roboranda illa, quæ in contentionem veniunt, minus idonea judicatur.*" Præter illud, quod sæpissime in suis scriptis Deutero-Canonicas Scripturas arcessierit, utpote divina auctoritate præditas, hoc argumentum sub dilemmatis specie in medio ponamus. Vel* Hieronymus, prædictis similibus verbis, divinitus inspiratas has Posteriores Scripturas credidit, seu* aliter sensit. Si divina inspiratione scripta fuisse hæc Biblia credebat Sanctus, necesse est sustollere discrepantiam, quam ille superius commentus est, et alias causas, scilicet viros, loca, seu tempora repetere, inter quas maxime esset notanda *prudentia haud* illorum auctoritate *coram Judæis utendi,* sicuti dictum est; nam dum divinarum Scripturarum titulo insignita sunt ab eodem, nulla differentia inter Priores et Posteriores Scripturas est admittenda, quoniam unus idemque Spiritus, essentia immutabilis, sapiens, suisque in verbis infallibilis auctor primarius esset, ac simplex instrumentum scriptor moneret. Contra vero, si divus pater Biblia eadem nonnisi ingenii humani fœtum ac præter inspirationem noverat, eidem nulla

* Such grammatical errors as these, with which this work, written by a Roman Professor, and printed at the Roman Propaganda, abounds, indicates much degeneracy in Italian Latinity.

ratione ex iis, utpote divini libri, et Scripturarum partes, plurima testimonia sumenda forent, neque nomine, neque honoribus paria existimanda illis Proto-Canonicis quasi libri divini, scripta sacra, vel prophetica, ut antea egisse ostendi; ad summum, doctor æstimatione, et auctoritate eos exornasset, quam scriptis Ecclesiæ doctorum, qui eum præcesserunt, impertivit, quod nullibi fecit, nec excogitavit.

Certo, nobis Hieronymi zelum, et *animum illius effervescentem, atque ætatem condonantibus*, doctor cunctis præsto erit tum episcopis complacendo, consuetudinem seu Ecclesiæ traditionem recolendo, tum doctrinam Catholicam et Apostolicam complectendo, ac tandem Ecclesiæ Romanæ exhibendo se socium.

APPENDIX B.

ON THE TRUE CHARACTER AND POSITION OF THE APOCRYPHA.

HOOKER, Ecclesiastical Polity, v. 20.

Of Preaching by the public Reading of other profitable instructions; and concerning Books Apocryphal.

Other public Readings there are of books and writings *not canonical*, whereby the Church doth also preach, or openly make known the doctrine of virtuous conversation; whereupon, besides those things in regard whereof we are thought to read the Scriptures of God amiss, it is thought amiss, that we read in our Churches any thing at all besides the Scriptures.

To exclude the reading of any such profitable instruction as the Church hath devised for the better understanding of Scripture, or for the easier training up of the people in holiness and righteousness of life, they plead,* that God in the Law would have nothing brought into the Temple, neither besoms, nor flesh-hooks, nor trumpets, but those only which were sanctified; that, "for the expounding of darker places," we ought to follow the Jews' Polity,† who under Antiochus, where they had not the commodity

* T. C. [*i. e.* Thomas Cartwright, the celebrated Puritan Divine] lib. i. p. 196. "Neither the Homilies, nor the Apocrypha, are at all to be read in the Church. Wherein, first, It is good to consider the order which the Lord kept with his people in times past, when He commanded, Exod. xxx. 29, that no vessel nor no instrument, either besom, or flesh-hook, or pan, &c. should come into the Temple, but those only which were sanctified and set apart for that use. And in the Book of Numbers He will have no other trumpets blown to call the people together, but those only which were set apart for that purpose. Numb. x. 2."

† T. C. lib. i. p. 197. "Besides this, the Polity of the Church of God in times past is to be followed," &c.

of Sermons, appointed always at their meetings somewhat out of the Prophets to be *read together with the Law*, and so by the one made the other plainer to be understood; that before and after our Saviour's coming, *they neither read Onkelos' nor Jonathan's Paraphrase, though having both*, but contented themselves with the reading only of Scriptures;* that if in the Primitive Church there had been any thing read besides the monuments of the Prophets and Apostles, Justin Martyr and Origen,† who mention these, would have spoken of the other likewise; that, the most ancient and best Councils forbid any thing to be read in Churches, saving Canonical Scripture only;‡ that, when other things were afterwards permitted,§ fault was found with it, it succeeded but ill, the Bible itself was thereby in time quite and clean thrust out.‖

Which arguments, if they be only brought in token of the authors' good-will and meaning towards the cause which they would set forward, must accordingly be accepted of by them who already are persuaded the same way. But if their drift and purpose be to persuade others, it would be demanded, by what rule the legal hallowing of besoms and flesh-hooks must needs exclude all other readings in the Church save Scripture.

Things sanctified were thereby in such sort appropriated unto God, as that they might never afterwards again be made common. For which cause, the Lord, to sign and mark them as his own, appointed oil of holy ointment, the like whereunto it was not lawful to make for ordinary and daily uses.¶ Thus the anointing of Aaron and his sons tied them to the office of the priesthood for ever;** the anointing, not of those silver trumpets†† (which Moses as well for secular as sacred uses was commanded to make, not to sanctify), but the unction of the tabernacle, the table, the laver, the altar of God, with all the instruments appertaining thereunto, this made them for ever holy unto Him, in whose service they were employed.‡‡

* Acts xiii. 15; xv. 21.

† Justin. Apol. 2. Origen. Hom. 1. super Exod. [11. 129.] et in Judic. [458.]

‡ Concil. Laod. can. 59. § Concil. Vasens. 2.

‖ Concil. Colon. par. 2. [c. 6. A. D. 1536.] ¶ Exod. xxx. 25, 32.

** Exod. xl. 15. †† Num. x. 2. ‡‡ Exod. xxvii. 3; xxx. 26—28.

But what of this? Doth it hereupon follow, that all things now in the Church, from the greatest to the least, are unholy, which the Lord hath not himself precisely instituted? for so those rudiments, they say, do import.* Then is there nothing holy, which the Church by her authority hath appointed; and consequently all positive Ordinances that ever were made by Ecclesiastical power touching spiritual affairs, are profane, they are unholy. I would not wish them to undertake a work so desperate as to prove, that for the people's instruction no kind of reading is good, but only that which the Jews devised under Antiochus, although even that be also mistaken. For, according to Elias† the Levite (out of whom it doth seem borrowed), the thing which Antiochus forbad was the public reading of the Law, and not Sermons upon the Law. Neither did the Jews read a portion of the Prophets together with the Law to serve for an interpretation thereof, because Sermons were not permitted them; but, instead of the Law, which they might not read openly, they read of the Prophets that which in likeness of matter came nearest to each section of their Law. Whereupon, when afterwards the liberty of reading the Law was restored, the self-same custom as touching the Prophets did continue still. If neither the Jews have used publicly to read their Paraphrasts, nor the Primitive Church for a long time any other writings than Scripture,‡ except the cause of their not doing

* T. C. lib. i. p. 197. "The Lord would by these rudiments and pædagogie teach, that He would have nothing brought into the Church but that which He had appointed."

† Elias Thesb. in verbo Patar.

‡ T. C. lib. i. p. 197. "This practice continued still in the Churches of God after the Apostles' times, as may appear by the second Apology of Justin Martyr." Idem, p. 198. "It was decreed in the Council of Laodicea, that nothing should be read in the Church but the Canonical Books of the Old and New Testament. . . . . Afterward, as corruptions grew in the Church, the reading of Homilies and of Martyrs' Lives was permitted. . . . . But, besides the evil success thereof, that use and custom was controlled, as may appear by the Council of Colen, albeit otherwise Popish. . . . . The bringing in of Homilies and Martyrs' Lives hath thrust the Bible clean out of the Church, or into a corner."

it were some Law of God, or Reason forbidding them to do that which we do, why should the latter ages of the Church be deprived of the liberty the former had? Are we bound, while the world standeth, to put nothing in practice but only that which was at the very first?

Concerning the Council of Laodicea, as it forbiddeth the reading of those things which are not Canonical, so it maketh some things not Canonical which are.* Their judgment in this we may not, and in that we need not, follow. We have by thus many years' experience found, that exceeding great good, not incumbered with any notable inconvenience, hath grown by the custom which we now observe. As for the harm whereof judicious men have complained in former times; it came not of this, that other things were read besides the Scripture, but that so evil choice was made.

With us there is never any time bestowed in Divine Service without the reading of a great part of the Holy Scripture, which we account a thing most necessary. We dare not admit any such Form of Liturgy, as either appointeth *no Scripture at all, or very little,* to be read in the Church. And therefore the thrusting of the Bible out of the House of God, is rather there to be feared where men esteem it a matter so indifferent,† whether the same be by solemn appointment read publicly or not read, the bare text excepted which the Preacher haply chooseth out to expound. But let us here consider, what the practice of our Fathers before us hath been, and how far forth the same may be followed. We find that in ancient times there was publicly read first the Scripture,‡ as namely something out of the Books of the Prophets of God

* The Apocalypse. [can. 60.]

† T. C. lib. ii. p. 381. "It is untrue, that simple Reading is necessary in the Church. . . . . A number of churches which have no such Order of simple Reading, cannot be in this point charged with the breach of God's commandment, which they might be, if simple Reading were necessary." By "simple Reading" he meaneth the custom of bare reading more than the Preacher at the same time expoundeth unto the people.

‡ "Coimus ad divinarum literarum commemorationem." Tertull. Apol. p. 692. [c. 39.]

which were of old;* something out of the Apostles' writings;† and lastly, out of the holy Evangelists some things which touched the person of our Lord Jesus Christ himself.‡

The cause of their reading first the Old Testament, then the New, and always somewhat out of both, is most likely to have been that which Justin Martyr and St. Augustine observe in comparing the two Testaments. "The Apostles (saith the one) have taught us as themselves did learn, first the precepts of the Law, and then the Gospels. For what else is the Law but the Gospel foreshowed? What other the Gospel, than the Law fulfilled?§ In like sort the other, "What the Old Testament hath, the very same the New containeth; but that which lieth there as under a shadow, is here brought forth into the open sun. Things there prefigured, are here performed."|| Again, "In the Old Testament there is a close comprehension of the New; in the New, an open discovery of the Old." To be short, the method of their public readings either purposely did tend, or at the leastwise doth fitly serve, "That from smaller things the mind of the hearers may go forward to the knowledge of greater, and by degrees climb up from the lowest to the highest things."¶

Now besides the Scripture, the Books which they called *Ecclesiastical* were thought not unworthy sometime to be brought into public audience, and with that name they entituled the Books which *we term Apocryphal.* Under the self-same name they also comprised certain, no otherwise annexed unto the New than the

* "Judaicarum Historiarum libri traditi sunt ab Apostolis legendi in Ecclesiis." Origen, in Jos. Hom. 15.

† Πάντων κατὰ πόλεις ἢ ἀγροὺς μενόντων ἐπὶ τὸ αὐτὸ συνέλευσις γίνεται, καὶ τὰ ἀπομνημονεύματα τῶν Ἀποστόλων ἢ τὰ συγγράμματα τῶν Προφητῶν ἀναγινώσκεται, Justin. Apol. 2. p. 162. "Factum est ut ista die Dominica, Prophetica lectione jam lecta, ante altare adstante qui lectionem S. Pauli proferret beatissimus Antistes Ambrosius, &c." Sulpit. Sever. lib. iii. de Vita S. Mart. [Greg. Turon. de Mir. S. Mart. i. c. 5.]

‡ Vide Concil. Vas. 2. habitum An. Dom. 444. tom. Concil. 2. p. 19. Item Synod. Laod. can. 16. Cypr. lib. ii. ep. 5. et lib. iv. ep. 5. Ambros. lib. i. Offic. cap. 8. et ep. 75. et lib. de Helia atque jejunio. cap. 20.

§ Just. resp. 101. || August. quæst. 33. in Num.

¶ Walaf. Strab. de rebus Ecclesiast. cap. 22.

former to the Old Testament, as a Book of Hermas, Epistles of Clement, and the like. According therefore to the phrase of antiquity, these we may term the New, and the other the Old Ecclesiastical Books or Writings. For we, being directed by a sentence (I suppose) of St. Jerome, who saith, that "all Writings not Canonical are Apocryphal,"* use not now the title *Apocryphal* as the *rest of the Fathers ordinarily* have done, whose custom is so to name for the most part only such as might *not publicly be read or divulged*. Ruffinus therefore having rehearsed the self-same Books of Canonical Scripture, which with us are held to be *alone Canonical*, addeth immediately, by way of caution, "We must know that *other* Books there are also, which our forefathers have used to name not *Canônical* but *Ecclesiastical Books*, as the Book of *Wisdom*, *Ecclesiasticus*, *Toby*, *Judith*, *the Maccabees*, in the *Old Testament;* in the New, the Book of Hermas, and such others: all which Books and Writings they willed to be *read* in Churches, but not to be alleged as if their authority did bind us to build upon them our *faith*. *Other* Writings they named *Apocryphal*, which they would *not have read* in Churches. These things delivered unto us from the Fathers we have in this place thought good to set down."† So far Ruffinus.

He which considereth notwithstanding what store of false and forged Writings,‡ dangerous unto Christian belief, and yet bearing glorious inscriptions, began soon upon the Apostles' times to be admitted into the Church, and to be honoured as if they had been indeed Apostolic, shall easily perceive what cause the Provincial Synod of Laodicea§ might have *as then* to prevent especially the danger of Books made newly Ecclesiastical, and for fear of the fraud of Heretics, to provide that such public Readings might be *altogether taken out of Canonical Scripture*. Which Ordinance respecting but that abuse that grew through the intermingling of Lessons human with sacred, at such time as the one both affected the credit and usurped the name of the other (as by

* Hieron. in prol. Galeat.

† Ruffinus in Symbol. Apost. apud Cypr. [§ 38.]

‡ Vide Gelas. Decret. tom. Concil. 2. p. 462.

§ Circa An. Dom. 366.

the Canon of a later Council,* providing remedy for the self-same evil, and yet allowing the old Ecclesiastical Books to be read, it doth more plainly and clearly appear), neither can be construed, nor should be urged utterly to prejudice our use of those old Ecclesiastical Writings; much less of Homilies, which were a third kind of Readings usual in former times, a most commendable institution, as well then to supply the casual† as now the necessary defect of Sermons. In the heat of general persecution, whereunto Christian belief was subject upon the first promulgation thereof throughout the world, it much confirmed the courage and constancy of weaker minds, when public relation was made unto them after what manner God had been glorified through the sufferings of Martyrs, famous amongst them for holiness during life, and at the time of their death, admirable in all men's eyes through miraculous evidence of grace divine assisting them from above. For which cause the virtues of some being thought expedient to be annually had in remembrance above the rest, this brought in a fourth kind of public Reading, whereby the lives of such Saints and Martyrs had at the time of their yearly memorials solemn recognition in the Church of God.‡ The fond imitation of which laudable custom being in later ages resumed, when there was neither the like cause to do as the Fathers before had done, nor any care, conscience, or wit, in such as undertook to perform that work, some *brainless men have by great labour and travail* brought to pass, that the Church is now ashamed of nothing more than of Saints.

If, therefore, Pope Gelasius§ did so long sithence see those defects of judgment, even then, for which the reading of the Acts of

* Concil. Carthag. 3. c. 47. "Præter Scripturas Canonicas nihil in Ecclesiis legatur sub nomine divinarum Scripturarum." Circa An. Dom. 401.

† Concil. Vasen. 2. habitum An. Dom. 444. tom. Concil. 2. p. 19 "Si Presbyter, aliqua infirmitate prohibente, per seipsum non potuerit prædicare, Sanctorum Patrum Homiliæ a Diaconibus recitentur."

‡ Concil. Carthag. 3. can. 13. et Greg. Turon. de gloria mart. ca. 86. et Hadrian. epist. ad Carol. Magn.

§ Gelas. circa. An. Dom. 492, tom. Concil. 2 p. 461.

Martyrs should be, and was at that time, forborne in the Church of Rome; we are not to marvel, that afterwards Legends being grown in a manner to be nothing else but heaps of frivolous and scandalous vanities, they have been even with disdain thrown out, the very nests which bred them abhorring them.*

We are not therefore to except only Scripture, and to make confusedly all the residue of one suit, as if they who abolish Legends could not without incongruity retain in the Church either *Homilies* or those *old Ecclesiastical* Books. Which Books in case myself did think, as some others do, safer and better to be left publicly unread; nevertheless, as in other things of like nature, even so in this,† my private judgment I should be loth to oppose against the force of their reverend authority, who rather considering the divine excellency of some things in all, and of all things in certain of those Apocrypha which we publicly read, have thought it better to let them stand as a list or marginal border unto the Old Testament, and though *with divine*, yet *as human* compositions, to grant at the least unto *certain* of them public audience in the House of God. For inasmuch as the due estimation of heavenly truth dependeth *wholly* upon the known and approved authority of those famous *Oracles of God*, it greatly behoveth the Church to have always most especial care, lest through confused mixture at any time, human usurp the room and title of divine Writings. Wherefore, albeit for the people's more plain instruction (as the ancient use hath been)‡ we read in our Churches certain Books *besides* the *Scripture*, yet *as* the *Scripture* we read them not. All men know our professed opinion touching the difference whereby we sever them from the Scripture. And if any where it be suspected, that some one or other will haply mistake a thing so manifest in every man's eye, there is no let, but that as often as those books are read, and need so requireth, the *style of their difference may expressly be* mentioned, to bar even all possibility of error.

* Concil. Colon. celebrat. An. Dom. 1536, par. ii. cap. 6. Melch. Can. locor. theol. lib. xi. Viv. de trad. disc. lib. v.

† "In errorum barathrum facilitur ruunt, qui conceptus proprios patrum definitionibus anteponunt." cap. un. de Relig. do. in extra.

‡ Hieron. præf. ad libros Salom. Aug. de præd. Sanct. lib. i. c. 14. Præf. gloss. ord. et lyr. ad pr[illegible]. Hieron. [illegible].

It being then known, that we hold not the Apocrypha for sacred (as we do the Holy Scripture), but for *human* compositions, the subject whereof are sundry divine matters; let there be reason showed, why to read any part of them publicly it should be unlawful or hurtful unto the Church of God. I hear it said, that "many things" in them are very "frivolous" and unworthy of public audience; yea, many contrary, "plainly contrary to the Holy Scripture."* Which hitherto is neither sufficiently proved by him who saith it; and if the proofs thereof were strong, yet the *very allegation itself is weak.* Let us therefore suppose (for I will not demand to what purpose it is, that against our custom of reading Books not Canonical, they bring exceptions of matter in those Books which we *never use to read*), suppose, I say, that what faults soever they have observed throughout the passages of all those Books, the same in every respect were such as neither could be construed, nor ought to be censured otherwise than even as themselves pretend: yet as men through too much haste oftentimes forget the errand whereabout they should go; so here it appeareth, that an eager desire to rake together whatsoever might prejudice, or any way hinder the credit of Apocryphal Books, hath caused the collector's pen so to run as it were on wheels, that the mind which should guide it had no leisure to think, whether that which might haply serve to withhold from giving them the authority which belongeth *unto sacred Scripture,* and to *cut them off* from the *Canon;* would as effectually serve to shut them altogether *out of the Church,* and to withdraw from granting unto them that public use wherein they are only held as profitable for instruction. Is it not acknowledged that those Books are "*holy,*" that they are "*Ecclesiastical*" and "*sacred,*" that to term them "*divine,*" as being for their excellency next unto them which are properly so termed, is no way to honor them above desert; yea, even that the whole Church of Christ, as well "at the first" as "sithence," hath most worthily approved their fitness for the public information of life and manners?†

* T. C. lib. ii. p. 400, 401.

† Conf. Helv. in Harm. Conf. sect. 1. Belg. Con. art. 6. Lubert de Princip. Christ. Dogm. lib. i. c. 4.

Is not thus much, I say, acknowledged, and that by them, who notwithstanding receive not the same for "any part of Canonical Scripture;" by them who deny not but that they are "faulty;" by them who are ready enough to give instances wherein they seem to contain matter "scarce agreeable with Holy Scripture?" So little doth such their supposed faultiness in moderate men's judgment enforce the removal of them out of the House of God, that still they are judged to retain worthily those very titles of commendation, than which there cannot greater be given to Writings, the authors whereof are men. As in truth, if the Scripture itself, ascribing to the persons of men righteousness in regard to their manifold virtues, may not rightly be construed as though it did thereby clear them and make them quite free from all faults, no reason we should judge it absurd to commend their Writings as reverend, holy and sound, wherein there are so many singular perfections, only for that the exquisite wits of some few peradventure are able dispersedly here and there to find now a word and then a sentence, which may be more probably suspected than easily cleared of error by us, which have but conjectural knowledge of their meaning.

Against immodest invectives, therefore, whereby they are charged as being fraught with "outrageous lies,"* we doubt not but their more allowable censure will prevail, who, without so passionate terms of disgrace do note a *difference* great enough between Apocryphal and other Writings, a difference such as *Josephus*† and *Epiphanius* observe: the one declaring that amongst the Jews, Books written *after* the days of Artaxerxes were not of equal credit with them which had gone *before*, inasmuch as the Jews sithence that time had not the like exact succession of Prophets; the other acknowledging that they are "profitable,"‡ although denying them to be "divine" in such construction and sense as the Scripture itself is so termed. With what intent they were first published, those words of the Nephew

* The Libel of Metaphys. Schoolp. art 34.

† Joseph. cont. Ap. lib. i. [§ 8.]

‡ Epiphan. [de Ponder. § 4.] Χρήσιμοι μέν εἰσι καὶ ὠφέλιμοι ἀλλ' εἰς ἀριθμὸν ῥητῶν οὐκ ἀναφέρονται.

of Jesus do plainly enough signify, "After that my Grandfather Jesus had given himself to the reading of the Law and the Prophets, and other Books of our Fathers, and had gotten therein sufficient judgment, he purposed also to write something pertaining to learning and wisdom, to the intent that they which were desirous to learn, and would give themselves to these things, *might profit* much more in living according to the Law."* Their end in writing, and ours in reading them, is the same. The Books of *Judith*, *Toby*, *Baruch*, *Wisdom*, and *Ecclesiasticus*, we read, as serving most unto that end. The rest we leave unto men in private.

Neither can it be reasonably thought, because upon certain solemn occasions, some lessons are chosen out of those Books, and of Scripture itself some Chapters not appointed to be read at all, that we thereby do offer disgrace to the Word of God, or lift up the writings of men above it. For in such choice we do not think, but that fitness of speech may be more respected than worthiness. If in that which we use to read, there happen by the way any clause, sentence, or speech, that soundeth towards error, should the mixture of a little dross constrain the Church to deprive herself of so much gold, rather than learn how by art and judgment to make separation of the one from the other? To this effect very fitly, from the counsel that St. Jerome giveth Læta,† of taking heed *how* she read the Apocrypha, as also by the help of other learned men's judgments delivered in like case, we may take direction. But surely the arguments that should bind us *not* to read them, or any part of them publicly at all, must be stronger than as yet we have heard any.

* Præfat. ad lib. Eccles.

† Ep. lvii. tom. iv. p. 596.

APPENDIX C.

ST. AUGUSTINE'S LANGUAGE CONCERNING THE APOCRYPHA; AND CONCERNING THE JEWISH CHURCH AS THE GUARDIAN OF THE CANON OF THE OLD TESTAMENT.

(*a*) S. Augustin. *De Civitate Dei*, lib. xi. cap. ii. ed. Paris, 1838, vol. vii. p. 439.—Ipsa veritas Deus Dei Filius homine assumpto, non Deo consumpto, eamdem constituit atque fundavit fidem, ut ad homines Deum iter esset homini per hominem Deum. Hic est enim mediator Dei et hominum homo Christus Jesus.—*Ibid.* cap. iii. Hic prius per prophetas, deinde per se ipsum, postea per Apostolos, quantum satis esse judicavit, locutus, *etiam Scripturam* condidit quæ *Canonica nominatur*, eminentissimæ auctoritatis, cui fidem habemus de his rebus quas ignorare non expedit, nec per nosmetipsos nosse idonei sumus.

(*b*) *Ibid.* lib. xvii. cap. xx. vol. vii pp. 765, 766.—Prophetâsse etiam ipse Salomon reperitur in suis libris, *qui tres recepti sunt* in auctoritatem *canonicam*, *Proverbia*, *Ecclesiastes*, et *Canticum canticorum*. *Alii* vero *duo*, quorum unus *Sapientia*, alter *Ecclesiasticus* dicitur, propter eloquii *nonnullam similitudinem* ut *Salomonis dicantur*, obtinuit consuetudo: non *autem esse* ipsus non dubitant doctiores; eos tamen in auctoritatem, maxime occidentalis, antiquitus recepit Ecclesia. * * * * * Sed adversus contradictores *non tanta firmitate* proferuntur, quæ *scripta non sunt Canone Judæorum*.

2. In *tribus* vero illis, quæ Salomonis esse constat, et *Judæi canonicos habent*, ut ostendatur ad Christum et Ecclesiam pertinere quod in eis ejusmodi reperitur, operosa disputatio necessaria est, quæ nos ultra quam oportet, si nunc adhibetur, extendit.

(*c*) S. Augustin. *De Civitate Dei*, lib. xvii. cap. xxiv. vol. vii. p. 771.—Toto autem illo tempore ex quo redierunt de Babylonia,

post Malachiam, Aggæum et Zachariam, qui tunc prophetaverunt, et Esdram, *non habuerunt Prophetas* usque *ad Salvatoris adventum*, nisi alium Zachariam, patrem Joannis, et Elizabeth ejus uxorem, Christi nativitate jam proximâ; et eo jam nato, Simeonem senem, et Annam viduam jamque grandævam, et ipsum Joannem novissimum: qui juvenis, jam juvenem Christum, non quidem futurum prædixit, sed tamen incognitum prophetica cognitione monstravit: propter quod ipse Dominus ait, *Lex et Prophetæ usque ad Joannem.* Sed istorum quinque prophetatio ex Evangelio nobis nota est: ubi et ipsa Virgo mater Domini ante Joannem prophetasse invenitur. Sed hanc istorum prophetiam Judæi reprobi non accipiunt: acceperunt autem, qui ex eis innumerabiles Evangelio crediderunt. Tunc enim vere Israel divisus est in duo, divisione illa, quæ per Samuelem prophetam Sauli regi est immutabilis prænuntiata. Malachiam vero, Aggæum, Zachariam, et Esdram, etiam Judæi reprobi *in auctoritatem canonicam receptos novissimos habent.* Sunt enim et scripta eorum, sicut aliorum, qui in magna multitudine Prophetarum perpauci ea scripserunt, quæ auctoritatem canonis obtinerent.

(*d*) S. AUGUST. *Contra Gaudentium*, lib. i. 38, ed. Paris, 1837, vol. ix. p. 1006.—Et hanc quidem Scripturam quæ appellatur *Machabæorum non habent Judæi* sicut *Legem*, et *Prophetas* et *Psalmos*, quibus DOMINUS testimonium perhibet tanquam testibus suis, dicens, *Oportebat impleri omnia quæ scripta sunt in Lege, et Prophetis, et in Psalmis de Me:* sed recepta est ab *Ecclesia* non inutiliter, *si sobrie legatur vel audiatur*, maximè propter illos Machabæos qui pro Dei lege sicut veri martyres a persecutoribus tam indigna atque horrenda perpessi sunt; ut etiam hinc populus Christianus adverteret, quoniam non sunt condignæ passiones hujus temporis ad futuram gloriam quæ revelabitur in nobis, pro quibus passus est Christus; si tanta patientissime pertulerunt pro lege quam dedit Deus per famulum hominibus illis, quo quibus nondum tradiderat Filium.

(*e*) S. AUGUST. *De Civitate Dei*, lib. xviii. cap. xxvi. vol. vii. p. 815.—Incursantibus autem hostibus, nequaquam progredi ædificando valuerunt, dilatumque opus est usque ad Darium. Per idem tempus etiam illa sunt gesta, quæ conscripta sunt in libro;

Judith; quem *sane in Canone Scripturarum Judæi non recepisse dicunter.* Sub Dario urgo rege Persarum impletis septuaginta annis, quos, Jeremias propheta prædixerat, reddita est Judæis soluta captivitate libertas, regnante Romanorum septimo rege Tarquinio. Quo expulso etiam ipsi a regum suorum dominatione liberi esse cœperunt. *Usque ad hoc tempus* Prophetas habuit populus Israel: qui cum multi fuerint, paucorum et apud Judæos et apud nos *canonica scripta* retinentur.

(*f*) *Ibid.* lib. xviii. cap. xxxviii. p. 836.—Nec mirum debet videri, quod suspecta habentur, quæ sub tantæ antiquitatis nomine proferuntur; quandoquidem in ipsa historia regum Juda et regum Israel, quæ res gestas continet, de quibus eidem Scripturæ canonicæ credimus, commemorantur plurima, quæ ibi non explicantur, et in libris aliis inveniri dicuntur, quos Prophetæ scripserunt, et alicubi eorum quoque Prophetarum nomina non tacentur; nec tamen inveniuntur in *canone, quem recepit populus Dei.* Cujus rei, fateor, causa me latet; nisi quod existimo, etiam ipsos, quibus ea quæ in auctoritate religionis esse deberent, sanctus utique Spiritus revelabat, alia sicut homines historica diligentia, alia sicut Prophetas inspiratione divina scribere potuisse; atque hæc ita fuisse distincta, ut illa tanquam ipsis, ista vero tanquam Deo per ipsos loquenti, judicarentur esse tribuenda; ac sic illa pertinerent ad ubertatem cognitionis, hæc ad religionis auctoritatem: in qua auctoritate custo ditur canon, præter quem si qua jam etiam sub nomine veterum Prophetarum scripta proferuntur, nec ad ipsam copiam scientiæ valent, quoniam utrum eorum sint, quorum esse dicuntur, incertum est; et ob hoc eis non habetur fides, maxime his in quibus etiam contra fidem librorum canonicorum quædam leguntur, propter quod ea prorsus non esse apparet illorum.

(*g*) *Ibid.* cap. xli. p. 842.—At vero *gens illa, ille populus, illa civitas, illa respublica,* illi *Israelitæ, "quibus credita sunt eloquia Dei," nullo modo pseudoprophetas cum* veris Prophetis pari licentia *confuderunt:* sed concordes inter se atque in nullo dissentientes, sacrarum Litterarum veraces ab eis agnoscebantur et tenebantur auctores.

(*h*) S. Augustin. *in Psal.* 40.—Si aliquis perstrepit inimicus, et dicit, vos vobis Prophetias finxistis; proferantur Codices *Judæ-*

orum. Judæi tanquam capsarii nostri sunt: studentibus nobis codices portant. Apud *illos* sunt Prophetæ et Lex; in qua Lege, et in quibus Prophetis Christus prædicatus est.

(*i*) IDEM *in Psal.* 56—Proptereà adhuc *Judæi* sunt, ut Libros nostros portent ad confusionem suam. Quando enim volumus ostendere Paganis prophetatum Christum, proferimus Paganis Istas Literas. Quia *omnes* ipsæ Literæ, quibus Christus prophetatus est, *apud Judæos* sunt, *Omnes Ipsas Literas habent Judæi.* Proferimus Codices ab Inimicis, ut confundamus alios Inimicos. *Codicem* portat *Judæus,* unde credat *Christianus.* Librarii nostri facti sunt.

(*k*) IDEM, lib. xii. *contra Faust.* cap. 13.—Et quid est aliud hodiéque gens ipsa *Judæorum,* nisi quædam Scriniaria Christianorum, bajulans Legen et Prophetas ad testimonium assertionis Ecclesiæ?

(*l*) S. AUGUST. *de Unit. Eccl.* cap. 16.—Demonstrent ecclesiam suam in præscripto *Legis,* in *Prophetarum* prædictis, in *Psalmorum* cantibus, hoc est, in Omnibus Canonicis Sanctorum Librorum Auctoritatibus.

APPENDIX D.

ON THE CONSEQUENCES WHICH WOULD FOLLOW FROM THE TOTAL REJECTION OF THE APOCRYPHA.

I would gladly have been spared all reference to this topic; but a treatise on the CANON OF SCRIPTURE would be very imperfect without some examination of it. I should also have felt myself chargeable with ingratitude to that merciful Providence, which has watched over the Church of England, if I had omitted this occasion of inviting the reader to consider the great evils which would have arisen from the rejection of the Apocrypha from our Churches and our Bibles.

Perhaps these results cannot be more clearly displayed than by the following statement, derived from a recent work by the learned Romanist Professor, Dr. Malou, now Bishop of Bruges, on the "Reading of the Holy Bible in the Vulgar Tongue." Louvain, 2 vols. 1846. The whole of the art. 2, of the Ninth Chapter (p. 173—201) of his book, bears on this point, and deserves a careful perusal.

The author observes, (vol. ii. p. 173,) that the earliest Reformers, following the practice of the ancient Church, retained the Apocrypha. This he shows to be true of Luther (p. 174), Calvin (p. 175), and the Synod of Dort (Session x. 23 Nov. 1618); of Archbishop Cranmer* and the Church of England, in her Prayer Book, Bible,

* Compare Strype's Life of Archbishop Whitgift, book iii. near the end, p. 590, ed. Oxford, 1822.—Martin Marprelate "reckoned it up among the Archbishop's high crimes, that he commanded the Apocrypha to be bound up with the Bibles. The Archbishop said, that he did indeed give such commandment, and further, that he meant to see it observed; asking, WHO ever separated the Apocrypha from the Bible, from the beginning of Christianity to that day?"

and Articles (p. 178, 179), and in her Universities (p. 184, 185). He also proves the same of other foreign Reformed Churches in Switzerland (p. 177), Prussia, France, Sweden, Denmark, and Russia (p.174, 189).

He then charges those Protestants who reject the Apocrypha with separating themselves from the whole Church, and from their own predecessors; and with venturing on a step never taken by the Fathers, or Councils of the Church, or by the Reformers themselves; and with doing that very thing of which they *accuse* the COUNCIL of TRENT, and the CHURCH of ROME, that is, of *imposing* a *New Bible* on the consciences of all who would communicate with them (p. 199, 200.)

It next appears from this author, how this act is used by the Church of Rome to justify herself in proscribing Protestant Bibles, and how in this way it is an insurmountable impediment to the circulation of the Scriptures in Roman Catholic countries, and thus frustrates the good intentions of those who desire to disseminate them.

"L'Eglise (says he, p. 200,) se renferme dans les bornes d'une légitime défense, lorsqu'elle *proscrit* l'usage des Bibles *protestantes* (he means those which *exclude* the *Apocrypha*), qui ont été *mutilées* en dépit de ses lois et en haine de ses croyances. Les Bibles *tronquées* sont autant de manifestations de la pensée hostile . . . des armes déguisées par l'hérésie pour combattre *l'Eglise* et altérer notre foi. Toutes méritent l'aversion des catholiques et la réprobation des pasteurs. On ne peut donc ni accepter ni lire un de ces volumes, sans commettre aux yeux de l'Eglise un acte formel de désobéissance."

We can never be too thankful that these observations are not applicable to the CHURCH of ENGLAND.

God grant that they never may be!

APPENDIX E.

ON ST. PAUL'S EPISTLE TO THE HEBREWS.

PRIMASIUS Afer, Justiniano politanus seu Adrumetinus Episcopus, circa A. D. 550. ed. Lugduni, 1537. p. 473.

Ad Hebræos divi Pauli Epistola: Præfatio.—In primordiis hujus epistolæ dicendum est, quæ causa extiterit, cur Apostolus Paulus morem suum in hac epistola non servaverit: videlicet ut vel vocabulum *nominis* sui, vel ordinis describeret dignitatem.

Hæc igitur causa extitit, quod eam *nomine* suo non titulavit, quia *Judæis* scribebat suis fratribus, quibus odiosus erat, eo quod circumcisionem, et Sabbatum et sacrificia cætera, quæ lex præcepit observanda, ipse doceret non debere carnaliter observari post Dominicam passionem.

Nam illi, qui crediderant, Judæi, contendebant utrumque tenere, baptizari scilicet secundum gratiam evangelii; et circumcidi, Sabbatum quoque observare, secundum legis præceptum. Quapropter si posuisset *nomen* suum Apostolus in exordio hujus epistolæ, poterat evenire, ut ejus æmuli nomen illius in prima fronte legentes dedignarentur eam recipere: sicque utilitas lectionis differretur.

Nomen autem apostolatus idcirco non posuit, quoniam ipse Apostolus *gentium* constitutus, si nomine Apostolatus sui prætitularet epistolam ad eos directam, vocans se Apostolum, videretur illis fortasse, quod se vellet præferre Apostolo *Petro*, qui princeps illorum erat a Domino ordinatus, sicut idem egregius prædicator alio in loco dicit: *Qui operatus est* (inquiens) *Petro in Apostolatum circumcisionis, operatus est et mihi inter gentes.*

Fortassis etiam dicerent: Quid est quod Paulus doctor gentium præfert se Apostolis nostris Petro et Jacobo? scribat iis, quibus ordinatus est Apostolus: nam scripta nostrorum Apostolorum nos abunde possunt docere. Quo facto ostendit se non ignorare illorum superbiam, pariterque suam exhibuit humilitatem.

Simili modo etiam et Joannes Apostolus causa humilitatis, ejusque rationis nomen suum in epistola sua prætermisit.

Vel certe dicunt quidam, quod propterea, quia CHRISTUM erat in epistola nominaturus Apostolum, dicendo, *Habemus Pontificem et Apostolum confessionis nostræ*, JESUM *justum*, noluerit nomen Apostolatus sui in primordio hujus epistolæ ponere. Non enim congruum duxit, ut ubi CHRISTUM dicturus erat Apostolum, inibi etiam *se* Apostolum nominaret, maximeque in titulo: ne, videretur cuilibet præferre se CHRISTO.

Hanc autem quidam dicunt esse Barnabæ, quidam Lucæ, quidam Clementis, dicentes, quoniam si Pauli esset, ipse utique more solito, sicut in aliis, ita etiam in ista nomen suum præponeret. Sed si Pauli non erit, quia ejus nomine non est titulata ergo nec Barnabæ, nec Lucæ, neque Clementis, aut alicujus erit eo quod *nullius* nomine titulatur. Cui ergo horum adscribenda est? Utique egregio prædicatori,* quippe quæ ex lucido sensu, ex genere locutionis, comprobatur illius esse: quanquam subtiliori atque apertiori stylo comprehensa sit omnibus epistolis: nam fertur Apostolus hanc Hebræis missam, Hebræo sermone eum conscripsisse; in qua ipse peritissimus extitit, cum reliquas Græco sermone scripserit. Post discessum vero Apostoli Lucas evangelista Græco sermone eam comprehendit; ex quo postmodum translata est in Latinam linguam, sicut et reliqua.

* *i. e.* Paulo. vide sup. p. 426, lin. 26, 27.

THE END.

BOOKS BY THE SAME AUTHOR.

THEOPHILUS AMERICANUS; or, Instructions concerning the Church and the American Branch of it. Chiefly from the fifth edition of "Theophilus Anglicanus." By Chr. Wordsworth, D. D., Canon of Westminster. Edited by Hugh Davy Evans, LL. D. Large 12mo., . . . $1 50

ELEMENTS OF INSTRUCTION CONCERNING THE CHURCH. From the same work. Edited and enlarged by Hugh Davy Evans, LL. D. 12mo. 75

LECTURES ON THE APOCALYPSE, Critical, Expository and Practical. By Chr. Wordsworth, D. D., Canon of Westminster. 1 vol., large 8vo. 2 00

VALUABLE BOOKS RECENTLY PUBLISHED.

TRENCH'S HULSEAN LECTURES. I. The Fitness of Holy Scripture for Unfolding the Spiritual Life of Men. II. Christ the Desire of All Nations; or, The Unconscious Prophecies of Heathendom—being the Hulsean Lectures for 1845–6. 12mo. 75

TRENCH'S STAR OF THE WISE MEN; being a Commentary on the Second Chapter of Matthew. 12mo. 38

HARDWICK'S HISTORY OF THE ARTICLES OF RELIGION. 8vo. 1 75

THE BOY TRAINED TO BE A CLERGYMAN. By John N. Norton, A. M., Rector of Ascension Church, Frankfort, Ky. A new and much enlarged and improved edition, ... 38

PRACTICAL SERMONS. By the Rt. Rev. George Burgess, D. D. 12mo. Large type. These Sermons are eminently Christian, and beautiful in spirit and expression. They ought to have a welcome and cordial reading in every part of the Church.

THE WORKS OF THE REV. HENRY BLUNT, A. M.

Consisting of—

LIFE OF OUR SAVIOUR, ...	75
LIFE OF ST. PAUL AND ST. PETER, .	75
LIFE OF ABRAHAM, JACOB AND ELISHA,	75
SERMONS AND DISCOURSES ON THE ARTICLES, ...	75
The above in 4 vols., uniform, 12mo. . . .	3 00

BS480 .W92 .1854
On the inspiration of Holy Scripture;
Princeton Theological Seminary–Speer Library
1 1012 00053 7656